DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 967 80 IR 000 578

AUTHOR Cutter, Virginia M.
TITLE Dissemination Policies, Procedure, and Programs of Nine State Education Agencies.
INSTITUTION Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 74
CONTRACT OEC-0-72-0047
NOTE 155p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Information Dissemination; *State Departments of Education; *State Programs; *State School District Relationship; State Surveys; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS Colorado; Florida; Illinois; Iowa; *Linkage; Michigan; Montana; New York; North Carolina; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A research project investigated the dissemination practices of nine State education agencies (SEA) in order to identify useful techniques which could be adopted by other groups seeking to implement change. Interviewers conducted site visits in Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania; local background factors were surveyed and information was collected regarding dissemination activities, change strategies, SEA relationships with local districts, and the priority assigned to the dissemination function by the SEA. The study identified a variety of specific dissemination practices suitable to differing local conditions and also uncovered several themes common to the overall dissemination effort. These were that: (1) local planning is the key to educational change; (2) the SEA's function is to facilitate change, not to dictate it; (3) inservice is basic to diffusion and change; (4) no one strategy fits every situation; (5) broad professional and community involvement is essential to the successful implementation of change; and (6) the SEA's major function in this area is to serve as a link between research and development on the one hand and the educational practitioner on the other. (PB)

ED 090967

IR

DISSEMINATION

POLICIES
PROCEDURE
PROGRAMS

OF NINE STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

by

Virginia M. Cutter

Council of Chief State School Officers

Byron W. Hansford, Executive Secretary

IR 000 578

This paper was prepared pursuant contract Number OEC-0-72-0047 between the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Institute of Education. Writers for projects under Council and Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view and opinions expressed herein do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Council of Chief State School Officers or the National Institute of Education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This report represents an account of current dissemination practices in nine selected state departments of education. The report should be useful to all Dissemination Directors and their staffs in terms of comparing their programs with other states in the continuing search for new and improved dissemination techniques.

Such a report would not be possible without the cooperation and efforts of numerous people. The Council appreciates the conscientious and dedicated efforts of the principal researcher and writer, Virginia Cutter, Texas Education Agency. The Council also appreciates the cooperation and fiscal support for the project from the Dissemination Task Force of the National Institute of Education. We should also like to thank the nine chief state school officers who permitted us to study their dissemination programs, and the state agency contact people who graciously gave their valuable time arranging interviews, collecting printed materials, and answering questions. They are as follows:

Colorado, Commissioner Calvin Frazier and William Grimsley

Florida, Commissioner Floyd Christian, Marshall Frinks and Raymond Melton

Illinois, Superintendent Michael Bakalis and Angela D'Aversa

Iowa, Superintendent Robert Benton and Richard Schallert

Michigan, Superintendent John Porter and Alex Canja

Montana, Superintendent Dolores Colburg and Cheryl Hutchinson

New York, Commissioner Ewald Nyquist and Gregory Benson, Jr.

North Carolina, Superintendent A. Craig Phillips and William Brown, Jr.

Pennsylvania, Secretary John Pittenger, Neal Musmanno, and Victor Celio

Byron W. Hansford, Executive Secretary
Council of Chief State School Officers
January, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

COLORADO 6

FLORIDA 20

ILLINOIS 35

IOWA 51

MICHIGAN 64

MONTANA 79

NEW YORK 94

NORTH CAROLINA 112

PENNSYLVANIA 128

Conclusion 142

INTRODUCTION

Recent years have seen a growing emphasis upon moving ideas, good practices, from their source - the researcher's study or the practitioner's classroom - to other settings where they might be used. Federal dollars have supported a number of programs to facilitate this transfer of knowledge. ERIC, with its data bank of information, was an early expression of national concern. Other efforts were initiated under the National Center for Educational Communication (NCEC), United States Office of Education, and some are still continuing under the National Institute of Education (NIE).

Based upon the assumption that state education agencies "must serve as the primary linkage between the knowledge resources of the Nation and operating educational agencies," NCEC in December 1969 brought together representatives from the 50 states to explore ways to improve state capabilities in dissemination. Impetus from that meeting set in motion a series of events which included the study presented in this paper. In June 1970, the Texas Education Agency was awarded funds by NCEC to operate a project to encourage diffusion of good state practices in information dissemination. Following two national conferences under Texas' sponsorship for state dissemination representatives, South Carolina, in 1971, became the funding agent for the second phase of the project. Consistent with its philosophy that dissemination was an important state agency function, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) was actively involved throughout these years. The Council urged member states to participate in the national conferences, sent representatives to the meetings from the Council, and was frequently a major contributor to the program. In addition, the Council also worked

closely with NCEC and then with the Task Force on Dissemination from NIE in a state dissemination policy study. In 1973 with the creation of the National Institute of Education, which absorbed the National Center for Educational Communication, CCSSO took over as secretariat of the National Dissemination Project. As the coordinating mechanism for state education agencies, the Council was the appropriate institution to assume leadership of the project.

During the years various studies of the dissemination function in states had been made in an attempt to locate good practices and to encourage their adoption. An informal survey had been conducted by Texas. South Carolina had analyzed State Management Review reports to determine current programs. A logical next step was to carry out an indepth study through on site visits to selected state agencies. With funding from NIE, the Council was in a position to implement the survey. Nine states were chosen for the study: Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania. Each was included because "it had something under way which was worth sharing with other states" and together the nine represented some geographic distribution.

One of the major problems with any study of the dissemination function has been the lack of agreement about what the term means. During the first phase of the National Project, the following definition had been established:

> Dissemination [means] those functions of an SEA concerned with strengthening educational practice through identifying promising new programs and sending out information about them through a variety of media to a variety of audiences.

In the second study of the dissemination function, South Carolina has used the definition established by the U.S. Office of Education for the State

Management Reviews:

> Dissemination is communication about the operation and outcome of an educational activity in order to create an awareness and understanding of its value, leading to adaptation and adoption. (Emphasis in original.)

Other current definitions range from one reported in the Federal Aid Planner: "Dissemination - telling the story and assuring a beneficial impact on the school scene" to

> DISSEMINATION is defined as the sending of information either about the results of research or the products of development or the methods and materials being demonstrated. Included are all forms of information transmission, as by consultation or face-to-face communication, telephone calls, individual letters, newsletters, bulletins, brochures, booklets, manuals, films, recordings, exhibits, brief conferences, and short meetings - but only when the information is about research, development or demonstration as defined here. (Emphasis in original) Henry M. Brickell. A Survey of State Education Department Research, Development, Demonstration, Dissemination, and Evaluation. Institute for Educational Development. New York. 1969-1970.

Each of these definitions, valid as it is, was felt to be too narrowly based for purposes of the study to be conducted under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers. In a paper developed by the Council, dissemination had been defined as "a system for achieving implementation of improved practices and programs in schools."

During the visits to the states it was found that there was general agreement that "dissemination" referred primarily to the flow of information, by whatever means; while "change strategies" was used to refer to a coordinated series of activies or programs designed to bring about educational improvement. In the report of the study of the nine states, these two definitions have been generally followed.

Once the states to be included were identified, each chief state school officer was invited to participate in the study. If he agreed, he was asked to name a staff member to serve as contact person. Four of these contacts were executive assistants to the chief state school officer; two were associated with special federal projects; one was coordinator of the state's informat on center; one the director of research, the agency unit to which the information service was attached; and one, the public information officer. Each contact person was asked to arrange a series of interviews with staff members whose responsibilities were concerned with or touched upon the dissemination of information or educational change strategies. Each chief state school officer was also asked to participate in the study; seven of the nine chiefs were able to arrange their schedules so that they might be interviewed. In general, the staff members interviewed represented the following functions or positions:

- director of curriculum
- federal program dissemination
- director of information center or services
- technical assistance supervision
- public information office
- director of research coordinating unit
- staff library
- planning and research

Each state agency was visited from one and a half to two days, during which time the series of interviews was conducted. Although discussions varied from state to state, in general the following topics were covered:

- organization for, support of, and activities and programs associated with the dissemination function
- organization for, support of, and activities and programs associated with change strategies
- relationship with school districts, patterns of service, linkages
- state priorities

When the report of each state was completed, it was forwarded to the chief state school officer for review and comment. Their suggestions for clarifying have been incorporated.

Each report begins with some background description, including something about the state population and organization of the state education agency and the state's public school system. It was felt that it was only within the context of these factors that a description of programs and strategies currently under way could be interpreted. As Dr. Paul D. Hood has noted

> The important educational dissemination functions are basically the same everywhere; but because the contexts are different from state to state... the particular configuration of elements and activities constituting an appropriate dissemination operation in one state for one target audience, with specific needs at a specific time, will not necessarily be a good configuration in a different situation. (Emphasis in original) Paul D. Hood. The Elements of a Good Dissemination Program, address at the National Dissemination Conference, Austin, Texas. November 1970.

Since the states vary, so do the reports. No one format fits all. One practice, however, is consistent throughout: where it has been possible, the words of staff members interviewed have been used and appear in quotation marks.

Individually each report describes dissemination practices and change strategies currently under way in one state. Collectively the nine reports represent a "compendium" of promising practices, practices which may be of value to other states.

COLORADO

With a total population of some 2.2 million, Colorado has slightly under 578,000 public school pupils. A majority of these pupils are enrolled in school districts in the Denver metropolitan area. This six-county region accounts for around 55 percent of the total student population. Approximately 18.5 percent of the pupils in the state are from major ethnic minority groups. In the 1971-72 school year, 13.7 percent of the total student body was classified as "Spanish-surnamed students"; 3.9 percent as "black"; .5 percent as "Oriental"; .4 percent as "American Indian"; and the rest, 81.5 percent, as "Anglo". Among the minority group pupils, 79 percent of those classified as "Black" attended Denver metropolitan area schools. However, 64 percent of those identified as "American Indian" and 56 percent of the "Spanish ethnic group students" attended school located outside this region.

Colorado has 181 school districts, all but 22 offering a kindergarten through twelfth grade education. As one staff member noted, geographic problems account for some of the organizational patterns. Basically Colorado has a two-level system of public school administration: the state and the local district. Only five of the 63 counties have a county superintendent. In the 1971-72 school year, Colorado school districts were staffed by 28,572 certificated personnel. Total revenue for public school education in the state in 1972-73 was estimated to be $631 million, of which approximately 66 percent was from local and county sources; approximately 28 percent from state sources; and approximately 6 percent from federal sources.

Since 1965 Colorado has had legislation authorizing establishment of Boards of Cooperative Services (BOCS). Seventeen of these regional structures are currently in operation, 16 with paid executive directors. Supported from a combination of sources, BOCS have no monitoring or supervisory responsibilities for local districts. In 1973 each BOCS was allocated $10,000 by the Colorado General Assembly, under a bill designed to strengthen these educational units. Although the state has a long tradition of local control of public schools, this legislation authorizes BOCS "to assume specific powers which previously had been reserved exclusively for local boards of education." Regions served by BOCS were not mandated by the state but were drawn up by schools wishing to join together to receive services. As a result, they do not necessarily follow county lines. Trade areas and leagues for athletic competition helped to define boundaries. Membership in a BOCS is permissive. If schools choose to join, they may participate in one or more of the programs available. Developed in response to local needs and wishes, services vary from region to region. Collectively BOCS offer 92 different kinds of services, ranging from student oriented speech therapy to computer information retrieval. Staff sizes vary too. CDE personnel described BOCS "as agencies to help local districts to meet unmet needs." Because they were successful in that task, the structure became a permanent part of Colorado's educational system. BOCS are flexible and provide "a means of testing how best to deliver services to schools."

Management of Colorado's system of public school education is vested in a five member elected State Board of Education. Members represent the state's congressional districts and serve six year overlapping terms.

Major responsibilities of the Board include "appraising the work of the Commissioner of Education (whom the Board appoints), the Department of Education

(CDE), and the public school system; submitting recommendations for improvement to the Governor and the General Assembly; and distributing state and federal apportioned school funds." A unique feature of the Board is the "youth representative", a student selected by a different Board member each month to serve as that month's representative. An important aspect of this activity is the opportunity it provides for the Board to hear student opinion and concern in the 15 minutes allotted each representative. In turn, each student goes back to his district and reports to the student body.

By law, the Department of Education has responsibilities concerned with general supervision, consultative services, and accreditation. Four assistant commissioners head up the major units of the department: the Office of Program Management, the Office of Field Services, the Office of Department Management Services, and the Office of Library Services. In October 1973, one assistant commissioner's office was vacant with some consideration being given to departmental reorganization. Two executive assistants, one for Communications, the other for Intergovernmental Relations, complete the Commissioner's administrative staff. Under the statutes, the CDE is responsible for general education, kindergarten through twelfth grade, and state library services (the Commissioner of Education is also the State Librarian.) Vocational education is assigned to the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. The Director of Vocational Education is a staff member of the state agency concerned with higher education, completely separate from the Department of Education. In the fall of 1973, there were 90 professional staff and 97 supportive personnel in the CDE. No "subject matter specialists " were included in that number. The job of the generalist, and in the words of one staff member, "that's everybody", is to assist schools to locate a specialist, perhaps in a BOCS, perhaps in a college or university, if one is needed. Generalists are coordinators, facilitators. There is consensus that "there is no need for

curriculum or subject matter specialists as long as services are available from somewhere else." However, department staff maintain an up to date knowledge of trends and programs through such contacts as professional associations.

CHANGE AND DISSEMINATION

Although staff indicated that one of their major functions was to serve as change agents, many felt that there was "no organized, concerted effort of dissemination." According to the Commissioner, practitioners in the field are the best disseminators. Or as a staff member expressed it, "Linkers should be school people." The Commissioner sees one important dissemination role for the department in identifying promising "changes in how a local district plans, makes decisions, and evaluates." Practices would be reported in a way to encourage "transfer between districts of proven efforts."

For some years the department has encouraged local planning as a prime mover in bringing about educational change. Recent legislation calling for comprehensive planning and accountability has underscored this emphasis. To prepare them to work with schools in the planning process, personnel at the CDE have attended special staff development programs. Three years ago, 15 staff members were involved in "an intensive three-week training program funded by the United States Office of Education through the University of Colorado at Denver." Based upon the "Havelock method of change", the inservice has as its major purpose establishing "the concept of the department consultant as a change agent." Since that time, staff members having the training have "tried to indoctrinate the rest of the staff." Among consultants in the program are some now assigned to a small staff under the Assistant Commissioner for Field Services, which has major responsibility for accreditation, contract and standard, and the "school improvement process."

A planning sequence, the school improvement process was developed and ready for implementation some five years ago. A handbook describing the process and the departmental services available to assist with it was mailed out statewide. All 181 districts were invited to use the process and to become accredited by contract. Thirty-two districts indicated their acceptance by "letter of intent." As one staff member said, "These districts had a three-year jump on the accountability law of 1971, which basically requires the planning process." By October 1973, nine educational agencies in the state were operating under contract accreditation; 28 other school districts were in the process of self improvement plans to be submitted to the State Board of Education as the basis for their being accredited by contract. Accreditation by contract involves a commitment on the part of the local district to "comprehensive, continuous, long-range planning." In the words of a department publication, it focuses "on the requirements of the future, not the standards of the past. The emphasis is changed from measuring inputs to measuring results." Basic to contract accreditation is the development and implementation of an action plan by the district. The district's locally developed plan is "entered into as a contract between the local board of education and the Colorado State Board of Education."

Steps in the accreditation include 1) commitment by the school board; 2) pre-planning with "involvement of parents, teachers, students, school administrators, board members, concerned citizens representative of every social, economic, racial, and ethnic group of the community"; 3) planning, which focuses on where the school is, where it wants to go, how it will get there, and how it will know it has arrived; 4) approval, which involves drawing up a contract and acceptance by the local and the state boards of education; 5) implementation. In the words of a department publication: "Management-by-objectives

is at the heart of implementing this type of contractural plan for educational improvement." During step three, planning, student educational needs have been identified; goals have been set; and policies, instructional programs, staffing requirements, financial demands, and facilities needed have been analyzed. In addition, behavioral objectives have been developed for students; operational behaviors have been set for staff. Finally, an evaluation design has been developed, based upon student evaluation and how well the program is serving his needs.

Once the plan has been translated into a contract agreed to by both local and state boards of education, the district is considered fully accredited. Later, within three to five years, the CDE will "go into the district and evaluate it using the districts's own goals and objectives."

The department's role in the process has ranged from developing awareness of the importance of planning to developing inservice programs and providing consultative assistance. The CDE actually has the manpower to handle about 30 schools at a time in various stages of planning. One person is assigned to each school, with responsibilities for meeting once or twice a month with the local steering committee and providing other necessary assistance. A staff member reported that "starting from scratch, it takes about three years to get a school to the point where it is ready to write a contract." Among aids developed to help schools is an instructional package, "Managing Change," which requires approximately 12 hours of activity. The school improvement process team has provided regional workshops throughout Colorado. To determine the kind of assistance needed by schools, the team mailed out a questionnaire in the fall of 1973. Forty replies were received: 55 percent wanted regional workshops and technical assistance; 45 percent desired technical assistance only. This year fewer rounds of workshops are planned with more emphasis upon one to one

relationships.

Legislative concern for planning can be seen in the accountability law enacted by the General Assembly in 1971. The law spells out the responsibilities of the State Board of Education for describing and implementing a procedure for continuous examination and improvement of the goals for education in Colorado; identifying performance objectives which will lead directly to the achievement of the stated goals; adopting a procedure for determining the extent to which local districts accomplish their performance objectives; and recommending a procedure and timetables for the establishment of local accountability programs." Districts are required to report both to their own community residents and to the State Board of Education. In turn, the state Board reports to the General Assembly on its activities in developing and administering the program and on the progress of local districts toward the achievement of their goals and objectives. The law mandates that every school district establish an accountability committee composed of citizens, teachers, and administrators. This group determines what it wants the district to be accountable for - costs, programs, curriculum, building plans, results. The law also establishes a statewide accountability committee. During the fall of 1973, a local school staff member was to be brought to the department on a short term contract basis to assist districts in working with their accountability committees and in reporting to their committees. This pattern of contracting with people in the field to come to the department for 10 to 18 months was seen by the Commissioner as an effective tool for strengthening two way communication between state and locals and in moving promising practices foom school to school.

REGIONALIZATION OF SERVICES

Developed within the last two and a half years is the concept of a field

representative staff. Currently the department has five field representatives, each of whom works with every school district within the region to which he is assigned. Field representatives are service-oriented, with no monitoring or supervisory responsibilities. On occasion they may supervise in another region but not in their own territories; there they are "coordinators, facilitators, liaison, disseminators." Each contacts the superintendents in his region, probably calling on two schools a day. By invitation they also attend advisory councils of BOCS, local board meetings, etc. Consultative services provided range from help with purely administrative matters to services concerned with long-range planning and contract accreditation. It was noted that the field representative was frequently the first contact in persuading schools to consider accredidation by contract.

At one time the department tried having field representatives stationed away from Denver but found that this was not the most effective organization for "off-campus" people. The "latest word " which the field staff brought to schools was often "already behind time." Consequently, field staff are all located in Denver now. Each Monday these representatives coordinate their activities with other department personnel and are brought up to date on programs. For example, the career education staff member might meet with the representatives, explaining what is going on in his area and what decisions are being made. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of each week, the field staff work directly with schools, returning to the office on Friday to get requests for service to other units and to coordinate and stimulate assistance to local schools. Field staff are an important link in two way communication with local educational agencies. Because of their close contact with administrators, they can determine the major "kinds of feeling and reaction and problems which are emerging."

These can be relayed to top management at the department so decisions may be made. A recent "Feedback from the Field" report to the Executive Committee of the department indicated that there was a feeling among schools that there were "too many advisory committees" and that suggestions were being made that the department consider an "umbrella committee." A summary of departmental activities for the State Board of Education noted that "during the month of September 1973, the Field Representatives unit received from districts 126 requests for service...Seventy seven of the requests were serviced by the rield representatives; 35 were referred to other CDE units; two were referred to other state agencies; and 12 were pending as of September 28, 1973."

INSERVICE AS A WAY TO MOVE AN IDEA

A vital component of many programs, inservice is seen as a strategy for effecting change. In Colorado professional certificate renewal is dependent upon the accumulation of six hours of credit every five years. According to departmental regulations, "up to three semester hours of the required credit may be attained through successful completion of the appropriate number of approved local inservice education programs." State law specifices that the inservice programs must meet "totally, or in part, the specific educational needs of students in the school district(s) submitting inservice plans." In developing guidelines and procedures for approved inservice programs, the CDE followed its usual practice of involving practitioners.

Three tentative drafts were submitted to representative groups across the state. Under these guidelines, agencies developing plans - BOCS or local districts - must submit them to the CDE prior to offering the program. Recent legislation strengthening special education in Colorado appropriated $2 million for inservice education. The school improvement process team has also long included inservice as a vehicle for training teachers and others to be "school planners."

INTERNAL COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

Both staff meetings and printed materials are used to keep staff informed of developments and to provide for input from personnel into the decision making process. Composed of the assistant commissioners, the executive assistants to the Commissioner, and the supervisor of the Regional Interstate Program Planning Project, the Executive Committee meets weekly. Minutes of the meeting are widely circulated. An Administrative Council made up of the Executive Committee plus unit directors is also a vehicle for internal communication. Printed materials for department staff are the responsibility of the Communication unit attached to the Commissioner's office. edfo news of the week, distributed to all staff members, includes a calendar, news about people, and other information of general interest. In addition, a recent edition indicated that "With this issue, EDFO begins a series of items on Time Management." Also the responsibility of the Communications unit are a number of other printed materials, such as the report of departmental activities regularly transmitted to the State Board of Education and circulated to the whole staff. This document includes a brief statement of monthly activities of each unit of the department. A follow-up report of all State Board of Education meetings goes to assistant commissioners and unit directors.

Also produced by the Communications unit is Education Colorado, a tabloid, published monthly during the school year. With a circulation of some 40,000 including teachers, administrators, school board members, and legislators, Education Colorado is an important dissemination device. A recent issue featured information concerning regional accreditation meetings, a brief report on contract accreditation, details on preparing proposals for Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a discussion of Colorado's new finance law, descriptions of a new team approach being used by eight school districts in

working with the educationally handicapped. Printing costs for Education Colorado are borne by state funds; staff are supported by both state and federal funds. Although no formal evaluation of the newspaper has been conducted, the number of calls and letters regarding it indicate that it is being read. Field representatives report on its reception also.

The electronic media and audiovisual presentations are also used in informing both school staffs and the general public. Edlines is a taped report from 45 seconds to 3 minutes in length available to telephone callers. Changed every second day, the report highlights key department activities. Approximately 22 calls a day are recorded. Immediately following each Board meeting a taped report of action is also placed on Edline. On those occasions, the number of calls jumps to approximately 30.

Under consideration in the fall of 1973 was production of a film spotlighting exemplary practices in local planning and the effective school programs which resulted from such efforts. Programs to be featured would be identified by consultants working with districts. Planned as a low cost activity, the film would be available for showing on television. Although the department had "no media person on the staff now," the script for the film would be written by staff in the Communications unit with filming by a commercial producer. The firm was seen as a vehicle for both informing the public and reporting to the General Assembly. The Commissioner feels that such a film would be "a pat on the back for districts making effective progress" and would let the public "know about the planning effort, evaluation, and follow-through on the report to citizens." In developing the film, the department could draw upon past experience, as films, such as one depicting agency operation which had been produced in earlier years.

ADDITIONAL USE OF TELEVISION

In the Educational Technology Demonstration Project, the CDE is involved in a project funded by the National Institute of Education to test the feasibility of ground to air communication for teaching purposes. Also in the project are the eight Rocky Mountain States and other state agencies. Seven remote rural school districts, each with receiving capability, will be the pilot sites for the educational component of the project. Career education will be the focus of instruction.

PUBLICATIONS

In addition to Education Colorado and newsletters such as the one issued by the State Library and the one featuring the Right to Read Effort, the department publishes a number of bulletins. Each of these is processed through the Publications Unit attached to the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Department Management Services. When fully staffed, the unit supplies layout and graphic services. However, in the fall of 1973, the graphics section was not staffed. Among publications considered elements of the department dissemination program are evaluation reports of Title I ESEA, descriptions of Title III ESEA, and special bulletins, such as the one describing day care centers. Evaluation reports of Title I programs are distributed to all districts. The 1972-73 report included a list of "exemplary projects" selected on the basis of the quality of the project's evaluation. A major publication nearing completion in October 1973 was a Title III directory containing descriptions of every project. Copies were to be sent to every school, every BOCS, and every Title III project. In addition, copies were to be distributed to special audiences, such as the presidents of parent-teacher organizations. The Title III staff was planning personal distribution of the document where possible and was also calling upon the field representative to distribute copies. Such personal

contact was seen as strengthening the use and value of the publication to schools.

CONFERENCES

No discussion of efforts in Colorado to bring about educational change and to disseminate information can be considered complete without a description of two educational conferences. Approximately 500 key people in the state attended a conference on career education sponsored by the department, the Commission on Higher Education, and the vocational education board.

A second joint effort, the Changing Schools Conference, was expected to attract some 350 to 500 educators and others to Denver in late October 1973. Sponsored by the Metro Denver Urban Coalition, which includes the department, the conference was being held for the second time. Participants were to have an opportunity to tour two schools in the metropolitan area and to learn of other exemplary programs through presentations and an educational fair. Support from the conference was from a number of sources, including special education, drug education, migrant education, and Titles I and III ESEA. Participants were encouraged to come in a team including an administrator, a teacher, a parent, and, when appropriate, a secondary student. A unique feature of the conference was the two hours of graduate or undergraduate credit being offered through the University of Colorado at Denver. No formal evaluation had been conducted of the first conference; however, changes in the current one had been made on the basis of informal evaluation and suggestions received.

SUMMARY

A number of activities were underway in Colorado to bring about educational change. Chief among them were those focusing upon local planning. There was

consensus that the key to educational change was in the local identification of educational needs and the setting of goals and objectives to meet those needs. The department's role was seen as facilitative, encouraging local analysis and program development. Consultants were generalists, trained to provide assistance in planning, evaluation, and staff inservice. Attention was being directed toward development of mechanisms, films and printed materials, to expedite the transfer of good practices from one district to another.

FLORIDA

Florida's total population is approximately 7.4 million. In the 1970 census 80.5 percent of the state's people were classified by place of residence as "urban"; 17.3 percent, as "rural non-farm"; and 2.2 percent as "rural farm." The census also identified 84.2 percent of the total population as "white"; 15.3 percent as "Negro"; .1 percent as "Indian"; and .3 percent as "other."

For some years now Florida has had county-wide school districts, with the state's 1.6 million pupils in the 1971-72 school year enrolled in 67 county systems, kindergarten through twelfth grade. Only 10 other states have fewer school districts. As might be expected, the size of the population varies from county to county. In 1972, Dade County, in the southern tip of the state, had an estimated population of some 1.3 million, with 16.39 percent of the pupil population. Lafayette County, in the north, had an estimated population of approximately 2,900 with .05 percent of the pupil population. Population density per square mile in 1970 reflected a different picture, however, with Pinellas County, in the central Gulf Coast area having approximately 1,973 residents per square mile and Liberty County, in the Florida panhandle, having approximately 4 residents per square mile.

In 1972-73 Florida had an estimated 77,300 teachers and others on the instructional staffs in its public schools.

Current expenditures in 1972-73 were estimated to be $1.2 billion, with approximately 20 percent of this total from local sources; approximately 71 percent from state sources; and approximately 9 percent from federal sources.

The State Constitution of Florida provides for a State Commissioner of Education and a State Board of Education, both charged with the supervision of the system of public education. An elected official, the Commissioner serves a four year term. In addition to the Commissioner, who is the secretary, the Board is composed of the Governor and five additional state officials, all elected: The State Comptroller, the Attorney General, the State Treasurer, the Commissioner of Agriculture, and the Secretary of State. By law the Department of Education (DOE) is made up of the State Board of Education, the Commissioner of Education, and the staff, currently some 800 professional and supportive personnel. "Broad powers and responsibilities are assigned to the State Board and the Commissioner," concerned with elementary and secondary schools, kindergarten through grade 12; area vocational-technical centers for high school and post-high school students; general adult education; community colleges; the State University System (operated by a Board of Regents); and the system of residential schools for deaf, blind and deaf-blind students (operated by a Board of Trustees.)

By law, the staff of the DOE is organized into four divisions: The Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Division of Vocational Education, the Division of Universities; and the Division of Community Colleges, each headed by a director. The Commissioner's administrative staff includes a deputy commissioner, three executive assistants, three associate commissioners, and an assistant commissioner. Together with the four division directors, this group forms the Administrative Council which meets weekly. A Planning Council including the chiefs of the bureaus making up the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education also meets periodically.

In the fall of 1973, the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education was undergoing considerable realignment. For example, the Bureau of Curriculum

and Instruction and the Bureau of Teacher Education were being combined in order to strengthen their "change agent efforts." Other modifications in structure were also under consideration.

In addition to the staff located in Tallahassee, the DOE also has five regional offices.

Prior to the sixties, the Department was primarily concerned with regulation. Since that time however, a "new kind of relationship with local districts has emerged," one emphasizing leadership. The DOE has been increasingly concerned with planning, with identifying needs and providing technical assistance within the needs identified. The trend has been, as a staff member said, "toward cutting districts loose, giving districts a stronger role in decision making." As an agency publication puts it: "The Department of Education is committed to a policy of positive change in the state system of education and this commitment extends to a redefinition of the state's role in the maintenance and control of that system."

In keeping with this view is what one publication described as the "state's officially adopted 'change strategy'". It consists of three elements:

1. Clarifying Goals and Objectives -- what educational programs ought to accomplish and what is being accomplished.

2. Assessment and Analysis -- concentrating on finding out how well the goals and objectives are being attained.

3. Alternative Practices -- identifying additional and better ways to achieve objectives.

"Along with the change strategy," the publication continues, "the state has adopted an official approach to its leadership for improving education

which is:

> To provide greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs but at the same time make them more accountable for the results."

Or, as a staff member noted, "In the last five years, the department has changed its pattern of operation and has turned operation of local districts over to local districts." Currently, the emphasis is upon "post-audit, not prior approval."

Combined with, and frequently stemming from departmental efforts, has been legislation which allocates funds for research and development "to bring about significant change in education." Additional legislation has required that "statewide objectives be established and that student achievement of the objectives be assessed." Other significant legislation has created a new funding formula for state aid to districts, as well as mandating comprehensive educational planning, and progress reporting from the local school level. In short, legislation has provided both flexibility and accountability.

In conjunction with the new pattern of relationships with local districts, the official change strategy, and the legislative mandates, a number of departmental programs and activities have been directed toward research and development, preservice and inservice teacher education, and comprehensive educational planning. Basic to, and supportive of, these programs is the department-wide focus upon dissemination.

CHANGE STRATEGY: RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Florida R&D program was authorized by the State Legislature in 1969 for the "sole purpose of sponsoring the designing, development, testing, and evaluation, on a pilot project basis, of applied or action research studies or projects which seek information on questions of critical concern to present and future educational needs of this state." Two groups were set

up to assist the department in operating the R&D effort: an Advisory Council, composed of "no less than twelve persons...representative...of education... and lay citizens and students"; and a Board of Governors, composed of no more than nine members including "citizens and professional representatives from several different levels of education...including individuals of national prominence in education from both within and without the state." In general, the Advisory Council identifies needs for educational research and the Board recommends priorities and plans. Both groups are appointed by the State Board of Education upon recommendation of the Commissioner. Since its inception, the program has undergone some modification, both in management and direction. During its first year of operation, research efforts were concerned with some nine areas; in subsequent years emphasis has been placed upon building a more unified program, with "each piece inter-related." Monitoring was also "strengthened by placing greater responsibilities on Department staff members coordinating projects."

Research and development funds have supported 1) projects "for clarifying objectives and for developing techniques to assess education results, resource utilization, and costs," 2) projects "to develop and demonstrate alternative educational practices, and 3) projects "for improving the capabilities of educational personnel." While the majority of these have been funded through institutions of higher education, some have been contracted to county school systems; some, to educational associations and private companies; and some have been "non-contracted"; that is, they have been carried out by the department. Each project has a staff member from the DOE assigned as a coordinator. State support in 1970-71 was $1.2 million, with an increase of approximately $200,000 in each of the next two years. The recommended allocation for 1973-74 was $1.8 million.

One result of these R&D efforts has been to highlight the importance of dissemination both as a flow of information and in its broader meaning as synonymous with "diffusion." Recent legislation has mandated the production and dissemination of educational materials and products which have been developed "by or under the department of education through research and development or other efforts." In its fourth annual report, the Board of Directors pointed to the "necessity for developing an efficient and effective delivery system for R&D products." Consequently, emphasis for the coming years will be upon diffusion. Currently under consideration is a plan based upon the "agriculture extension agent model for bringing about change." For example, projects in priority areas such as reading and mathematics using "R&D products, available curriculum materials, and existing facilities and personnel" would be the focal points. Technical assistance would be provided full time by a DOE consultant living in the field, who would work with a school to "implant the ideas ." In the following year, teachers in the school who had become experts would in turn go into new schools as "resident extension agents" and train new teachers. With this "multiplier effect" from the R&D Extension Agent Training Center model, a "program could be spread across the state" within a few years.

In his response to the Research and Development Report, the Commissioner noted that "the new and emerging role of state educational agencies as product developers presents unique problems in the areas of dissemination and diffusion." He also wrote that "an orchestrated Departmental effort is being made to expedite the use and employability by teachers, principals, parents and other decision makers of those 'tools' developed by the ...Program". Research programs funded under vocational education have zeroed in on career education models, a state priority supported partially through state funds.

Educational innovations funded through Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, have been directed toward meeting eight critical learner needs identified through the state assessment. Both of these programs are developing plans to diffuse ideas. Vocational education is "using the experience and personnel from the career education models to assist other schools." Workshops and staff meetings are also vehicles for spreading the programs, and materials from the models are available. Upon the premise that "diffusion must be systematic", the Title III office is developing a model which will use printed materials to encourage awareness and interest; on-site visits to provide more in depth information; staff development conducted by the project people to train schools considering adoption; trial installation with technical assistance from the project to aid in successful importation; and a study of results to determine whether the transported program can achieve the same kind of results as the original one did. Conferences have also contributed to dissemination of Title III projects.

Both the R&D program and the Title III program are administered through the same departmental unit, the Bureau of Research and Information in the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education; the vocational research efforts are under the Division of Vocational Education.

CHANGE STRATEGY: PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE

Believing that the best way to bring about educational change is to modify the way teachers perform, the Florida Department of Education has for some time been concerned with strengthening both preservice and inservice education. Efforts to move toward competency-based teacher preparation programs are a case in point. Further evidence of this concern is visible in the state requirement for inservice. Legislation mandates that each "board shall

develop a comprehensive program of staff development." State Board of Education regulations provide that "effective participation in a district inservice teacher education program shall entitle a member of the instructional staff... to have his certificate extended" if the program meets criteria set by the DOE. (Certificates must be renewed every five years in Florida.) Further impetus for strengthening both preservice and inservice has come from the conviction "that new practices must get out but the only way to get them out is through teacher education" and "the real effort at dissemination must be through inservice." One of the charges to the new bureau created by merging curriculum and instruction and teacher education into one unit is "to get the products of research and development into schools and to provide the inservice so they can be utilized." Another channel for flowing information about alternative practices may be the "teacher centers" which will bring together local communities, universities, and school districts to work on common educational problems. These collaborative endeavors to improve teacher preservice and inservice "may have widespread implications for information dissemination practices of the DOE."

CHANGE STRATEGY: COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Two additional developments shed further light on Florida efforts to bring about contructive educational change: the legal requirement for a comprehensive annual and long range plan and the legislative mandate for "an annual report of school progress." Since 1972, each district, by law, has been required to develop and submit to the Commissioner for review a comprehensive annual and long range plan. A task force composed of teachers, administrators, local board members, and DOE staff has developed guidelines to assist schools in meeting this mandate. These guidelines stress that the plan is not a reporting document but is a planning and management tool.

Technical assistance in planning is available to all schools through staff assigned to each of the state's five regions. The planning unit at the department reports that it is developing "a corps of individuals in each region who are management-oriented, rather than subject-oriented." State and federal funds have been used for inservice for administrators, key decision makers. In addition, the Department works closely with professional organizations in upgrading competencies. Currently, attention is being directed toward the principals' association to assist it in developing a real leadership role. Identifying areas in which a district may need technical assistance is just one of the benefits from the state review of district plans. Others include assisting the state to spot problems which may need legislation for solution or may require a change in administrative procedure. Further, the review may uncover a need to develop specific competencies in the state staff in order to work with schools in solving weaknesses.

Closely related to comprehensive planning is the requirement for each school to make an "annual report of school progress to the public it serves." Passed in 1973, the legislation places special emphasis upon dissemination to a special audience, parents of public school students. It grew from "a need of public education to better inform its clients... of... achievements, problems, plans, and improvements." In its leadership materials developed to assist principals in meeting the requirement, the DOE has taken the position that the report, like the comprehensive plan, "can... be a planning and management document for school and district level decision-making." The content of the report, which must be sent to "each family having a child in the school" as well as to the DOE, must cover the following ten categories:

1. Effectiveness in Achieving Goals
2. Assessment Results

3. Attitudes Toward the School
4. School Improvements
5. Cooperative Sharing of Facilities - The School and the Community
6. School Advisory Committee or Other Parent Organizations
7. School Level Professional Improvement Programs
8. Population Data
9. Fiscal and Cost Accounting Data
10. Other Areas of Interest to Parents and the Public

Information gathered for the school report feeds into the comprehensive plan. For example, one instruction to schools specifies that "Innovative or unusually promising practices in the areas of citizen involvement or school improvement which are covered in the annual report are to be included as a part of the next district comprehensive plan." With its emphasis upon goals and objectives and assessment of how well these are being achieved, the report has implications for leading to constructive educational change.

COMMISSIONER'S PRIORITIES: DISSEMINATION

Research and development, preservice and inservice, comprehensive planning, the "school report card" - each of these efforts pointed to the need for a systematic flow of information. As a result, the Commissioner, in the summer of 1973, identified dissemination as one of the primary operational functions of the Department of Education. In his statement of "The Commissioner's Priorities for 1973-74 and 1974-75" he called for the department to

> Conduct coordinated and focused dissemination within an overall plan to reach specified groups of educators and specified factions of the general public.

A report made to the Florida Research and Development Board of Governors in August 1973 summarized the need for systematic dissemination as follows:

> Historically, the dissemination function of the Department of Education could best be described as a "hit-and-miss" operation. Indeed, information

> dissemination was taking place but only a few of the state's varied and multifaceted publics were receiving these services. Operating mostly on the "squeaky wheel gets the grease syndrome", DOE dissemination was not for the most part providing the necessary services which would have any potential impact on Florida education.

Steps are being implemented to change that picture, however. Under support from the National Institute of Education a project is being developed to "coordinate all identified information dissemination activities into a linkage design that would be consistent with Florida's commitment to the renewal of its statewide educational system." Immediate objectives of the newly funded project are defined as "determining the scope of current dissemination efforts to identify the clients-users of DOE products" and "determining current costs to provide these dissemination services." The project is also concerned with identifying and making recommendations "to resolve discrepancies between the information dissemination needs currently being met with the existing vehicles and those needs not being met." Finally, the project proposes "to consolidate and coordinate the existing dissemination functions and to determine the advantages and disadvantages of alternative strategies for information dissemination." A project coordinator has been assigned to the staff of the Associate Commissioner for Planning and Coordination and first steps have been taken to implement the project. Dissemination has been defined as "a system for achieving implementation of improved practices and programs in schools. This system includes provisions for the acquisition, distribution, follow-up and evaluation of alternative educational practices and programs." An in-house survey of the scope and effectiveness of current dissemination practices of the department was initiated with the following questions being asked each unit administrator:

What products and/or information are being disseminated?

To whom is it being disseminated?

What is the cost of this dissemination?

Can the needs which are being met, or the needs which are not being met by this dissemination effort be documented?

What future dissemination plans are being developed for your area?

Data from the Commissioner's staff indicated that 22.18 percent of the total mandays were in the service of dissemination. When the survey was completed, it was anticipated that next steps would involve having "people analyze" their programs, provide for answers to such questions as "What message are you trying to get across in your dissemination activities?"

While the survey was being conducted, an inter-unit task force was set up to "look at possible future directions the dissemination function of DOE might take." This group identified three elements of dissemination: "1) dissemination of information required for operation or management; 2) dissemination of documents and materials to aid instruction; and 3) dissemination of information to inform and influence." The task force noted that there was "a need to clarify the differences between these three elements" and agreed that one of the duties of the group would be to examine this problem.

ONGOING INFORMATION PROGRAMS

About two years ago in an effort to strengthen coordination of various information dissemination units a Communications/Media Service Center was established within the office of the Associate Commissioner for Administration. Brought together under a central administrator were public information, technical services, publications services, library, and Florida Educational Resources Information Center (FERIC).

Funded from both state and federal sources, the public information unit is responsible for news releases; the department magazine, Florida Schools; and Monday Report, a newsletter. With a change in both circulation and size, Florida Schools will be published four times during the 1973-74 year. Each issue will be limited to 24 pages and will include articles featuring promising programs in local schools as well as topics of concern to the department. With the number of copies printed increased to 80,000, Florida Schools will be sent to every teacher in the state for the first time. Monday Report, the official newsletter of the DOE, is published and distributed weekly to everyone within the department and to all 67 school superintendents, each of whom gets 10 copies. Content of the two-page newsletter is focused primarily on administrative information. By law every publication issued by the DOE carries a notation of cost and purpose. For example, Monday Report notes that "This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $12,886.12 or 8.2 cents per copy to inform public school administrators of pertinent developments."

From 160 to 200 publications requiring more than 500 copies are published annually, according to the center administrator. These include such bulletins as curriculum guides, statistical reports, guideline documents, and special reports. Some newsletters for targeted audiences are published but there is no coordinated effort.

On occasion, the center develops slide presentations for the department through technical services and "can do one-half inch video-tapes for conferences." The library includes professional books (many of the volumes in the card catalogue are housed in consultants' offices), a curriculum collection and all old and current textbooks. A research aid to the staff, the library will provide "some bibliographic services."

Greater coordination between the library and the Florida Educational Resources Information Center was anticipated.

The fifth section of the Communications/Media Service Center, FERIC is supported with both state and federal funds. "A research-oriented dissemination system," FERIC was developed by the Florida Research Coordination Unit for Vocational Education in 1968 with funds from the Vocational Amendments of 1968 and state appropriations. In 1970, the program was expanded to include services to the total public education community in the state and in 1972 it was transferred from the Division of Vocational Education to the Commissioner's Administrative Staff. FERIC's data bank includes a complete collection of ERIC documents on microfiche; 70,000 indexed resumes of educational journal articles; over 6,000 books, bulletins, and the like; several thousand current awareness articles, primarily newspaper clippings; subscriptions to over 300 publications listed in the monthly Current Index to Journals in Education; a subscription to the curriculum materials available through the Xerox Corporation; and a collection of fugitive research-related materials. Services are available to DOE staff, and teachers and administrators in school districts, community junior colleges, and state universities. A network of 66 satellite centers has been established including the state universities, 26 junior colleges, 21 area vocational-technical centers, vocational offices in the five regions of the state, and five "exemplary vocational programs." Each satellite has a trained information consultant who provides service. Each also has a limited collection of ERIC microfiche, readers, and other equipment purchased with funds from FERIC.

FERIC responds to approximately 150 requests for searches a month. In addition to bibliographic information, FERIC will supply microfiche, hardcopy

(on loan), copies of current awareness and other articles. Information from the human resources file and the "informal" promising practices file will also be supplied. Approximately 60 to 70 percent of the searches are referred to the DOE staff to follow up. During 1972-73, FERIC served staff from 33 of the 67 school districts. Although department staff utilize the service, there was a feeling that use would be stepped up if the collection of material specifically related to program areas were increased. In addition, a staff member reported a "need for a systematic way that every product developed through use of department funds could go to a central location for storage and retrieval."

SUMMARY

A number of efforts to bring about constructive educational change are currently under way at the Florida Department of Education. From the Commissioner who identified "coordinated dissemination" among his top priorities to staff implementing programs, there was concern "that there are products on the shelf not being used." Some DOE activities focused internally upon staff reorganization, upon strengthening dissemination; others focused outward. There was emphasis upon developing local decision making; local accountability. From research and development to preservice and inservice to comprehensive planning, there was focus upon three basic elements: setting goals and objectives; assessing progress in terms of those objectives; and selecting alternative programs and practices.

ILLINOIS

The "land of Lincoln" is a land of contrasts. Illinois has both densely populated urban centers and isolated rural regions. Although approximately one half of the state's 2.4 million pupils attend school in the Chicago area, 249 school school districts still enroll fewer than 300 students each. In the 1972-73 school year, the state had slightly more than 1,000 school districts. Of these, 509 were elementary districts; 146 secondary districts; and 436 unit districts. Geography limited consolidation of some of these districts.

Like a number of other states, Illinois is multicultural. This diversity too is evident in its pupil population, with approximately 77 precent classified as "white"; approximately 18 percent as "black"; approximately 4 percent as "Spanish-surnamed"; and approximately .5 percent as "American Indian" or "Oriental".

Public schools for these pupils are staffed by approximately 160,000 professional and supportive personnel.

Current expenditures for public school education in Illinois in 1972-73 were approximately 2.3 billion dollars. The largest portion, 55 percent, was from local revenue; the state contributed about 30 percent, and federal sources about 6 percent.

In 1970 the new Constitution of Illinois restructured the state's management of public school education. A State Board of Education was established with responsibility for appointing the chief state educational officer. Provisions

of the School Code enacted in 1973 call for the Governor to appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a 17 member Board on or before January 1, 1974. Not to assume full powers and duties until January 1975, the Board will "function in an advisory capacity to and with the current constitutionally established office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction." At present an elected official, the state superintendent is a part of the executive branch of the state government with "much autonomy and a great deal of independence on the part of the state education agency." When it assumes office, the new Board will "be responsible for the educational policies and guidelines for public and private school, pre-school through grade 12 and Vocational Education." Until then, vocational education is assigned to the Vocational and Technical Education Division of state government, which is not a part of the state education agency, although the superintendent of public instruction is the executive director of the division and serves on the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation.

Currently Illinois has 102 "superintendents of educational service regions" (county superintendents). On April 4, 1977, their numbers will be reduced with mandatory consolidations of regions with fewer than 33,000 inhabitants. These administrators are the official representatives of the state superintendent in the local area, primarily concerned with assisting school administrators and teachers.

As the state's educational leader, the superintendent of public instruction has a staff of some 1,000 professional and supportive personnel. Reporting directly to him are seven special assistants (Legal, Internal Audits, Community Relations, Public Information, Administrative Staff Chicago, Administrative Staff Springfield, and Southern Illinois Regional Office Mt. Vernon) and four associate superintendents

(Supervision and Instruction, Educational Planning and Management, Pupil and Professional Services, and Governmental Relations). Fourteen assistant superintendents head up the major departments of the four divisions administered by the associate superintendents. In all, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has 98 separate units.

Because of the size of Illinois, the state education agency has established three regional offices with a full complement of personnel in each.

CHANGE STRATEGIES

From the beginning of his term of office in 1971, the state superintendent has been concerned with educational change. In his inaugural address he pledged his administration to "self-renewal - the end of which will be education which is dynamic, responsive, relevant, and, most importantly, humane." He has stressed involvement of citizens in the decision-making process as basic to this educational change. His inaugural remarks also called "For a participatory democracy which would truly make the educational enterprise a public one."

A key strategy for bringing about such participation was initiated in the summer of 1971 when the OSPI held a series of public hearings across the state to identify priority goals for education in Illinois. Culminating this effort to provide for widespread citizen involvement was a statewide conference held in Chicago in September 1971. Described by one staff member as "unique in educational planning," the six hearings provided a "blank slate" upon which people of different ages, backgrounds, and viewpoints could express their concerns and hopes for education. More than 600 people took advantage of the opportunity to be heard. In analyzing their testimony for a document to be presented to the September conference, OSPI staff members found that two major themes emerged: "Substantive concerns" dealing with the form education should

take, such as individualized instruction, and "procedural concerns" touching upon such matters as financial support for public education, school organization, and preparation and evaluation of teachers.

The document summarized priority goals for the statewide educational system and set a timeline for implementation of action objectives. Reactions to and recommendations for revisions of the statements were secured from some 800 teachers, board members, administrators, representatives of higher education, and concerned citizens at the Chicago conference. Quarterly public hearings since that time have provided a forum for continuing citizen input into updating and revising the Action Goals for the Seventies, An Agenda for Illinois Education. The document provides both a direction for educational change and a framework for setting priorities for "the unique missions of the OSPI." As one staff member noted, "Action Goals provide the focus for all Office activities."

First evident in the public hearings leading to the Goals, the commitment to community involvement is also reflected in twelve citizens' advisory councils to the superintendent. Composed of 25 to 30 members, each council meets approximately five times a year. In the fall of 1972, council members - students, teachers, parents, administrators, board members, lay citizens, and educational service region superintendents - were asked to advise the superintendent on the priorities to be assigned to the Action Goals. Specifically, the groups were to consider the Action Objectives listed under "School Governance" to aid in the development of guidelines for changes in school governance, and to recommend revisions in the objectives. Completing their tasks at the end of the 1972-73 school year, the councils reported to the superintendent on September 1973 that additional in-depth study should be undertaken by a statewide task force. Although the groups were varied both in their primary concerns and in their recommendations, there was general agreement that "efforts to increase

participation of relevant interest groups in the school governance process were desirable and worthwhile." A majority of members also favored "improving the existing structure of local governance rather than radically changing it." Financial support for the OSPI office working with the advisory councils is from Title V, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, no funds were provided for council operation other than those for securing an occasional meeting place.

Also in keeping with the Office's pervasive belief that dissemination - communication - must be "two way, and not just expressed in rhetoric, but reflected in action," was a series of 1,000 coffees planned for American Education Week, 1973. Each to involve approximately ten people, these small group meetings were seen as "another milestone"in the "constant search for getting feedback." A kit provided for each coffee was to include a taped message from the superintendent, questions to guide discussion, and an instrument for securing "people's input." A guiding principle of working with all advisory groups is "always to get back to people who give input." The coffee groups too will receive a compilation of their reactions and suggestions.

PLANNING AS A KEY TO CHANGE

The Office philosophy regarding community involvement is again apparent in a second major strategy for change: requiring schools to begin a systematic planning process and to submit a plan to the OSPI. Included in the Revised Standards for Recognition, this requirement too resulted from development of the Action Goals, as a need for systematic educational planning had been identified at the public hearings. The revised standards were a year and a half in development. Before adoption in 1973, there were 12 statewide hearings to secure field reaction. Possibly "the most significant revision" in the standards is the requirement "that local districts develop a written program plan through widespread

community involvement and participation." Originally, each district was to submit its plan to the OSPI by September 1973; however, reactions from administrators were such that the deadline was extended to January 1974.

At the same time that districts were being asked to examine their operations, the Office was also concerned with its pattern of working with schools. To increase the quality of services to local units, the Office reorganized its technical assistance capability on the basis of teams. This service is being provided as a coordinated effort by staff members who, although they may work individually with districts, function as a team in planning for and following up their visits. The implementation of the planning requirement illustrates how one group of teams works. Five curriculum teams charged with assisting districts in the planning process have been established and assigned to different geographic areas of the state. Each team consists of six to nine members plus a leader, all of whom function as generalists. Each member works with administrators in approximately 35 districts. Basic to this development is the assumption that "substantive educational change is not initiated by teachers but by administrators." Not only has the delivery of state education agency service undergone change, but the relationship between the Office and districts is being modified. Formerly, the majority of contacts were in response to requests; it is hoped that a new rapport, in which OSPI staff members will "feel free to stop by a school" will emerge.

The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction prescribes a format for the school to follow in its plan, but the district is free to develop the content. In general, the plan will focus upon needs assessment, identification of problem areas, and the process for attacking the most critical. When completed, district plans are to be forwarded to the OSPI for review and approval. Staff assigned the review function may identify areas of weakness and can alert appropriate

specialists at the Office who will follow up with the district.

Although is is too early for evaluation of the effort, already there has been "positive feedback" to the team concept both from OSPI staff and from administrators. Consultants report that they are getting more deeply involved with the schools to which they are assigned and superintendents have indicated that they feel they are "in contact with a person" to whom they may turn for help with many problems. Flexibility has been a key to this effort, with team members adapting their methods of working with schools to local situations.

Additional benefits are seen in the opportunities which the close contact with schools provide for consultants to become familiar with exemplary and to alert other districts to them. One staff member described the teams as "catalysts to bring local districts together."

In implementing its new approach to technical assistance, the OSPI has offered a number of inservice programs for the staff involved. Since many team members were formerly specialists who now work as generalists, new skills and understandings were needed. In addition to staff development programs, resource materials have been prepared to assist staff members in their new "extension agent" roles.

ILLINOIS NETWORK FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Based upon the view that the state superintendent's office should be a "catalyst for change" are a number of statewide projects that have been designed to encourage dissemination of innovative practices. The Illinois Network for School Development (INSD) exemplifies both this belief and the Office's commitment to planning as a necessary first step in educational improvement. Begun in 1972, the network was to be a long-range program with 1977 as the target date for full

operation. It was to provide a vehicle both for "originating comprehensive educational improvement and for influencing school systems throughout the state to follow suit." A four-member unit was established within the OSPI under Title V, ESEA to offer leadership for the network. Financial support for the project in local schools was to be shared jointly by the Office of the State Superintendent and the Division of Vocational and Technical Education.

The State Legislature appropriated $50,000 for the INSD for the 1972-73 school year. On the basis of project proposals, ten districts were each allocated $10,000 in February 1973 to take a comprehensive look at their operations and to plan needed program improvements. Each district was to designate a target school to implement the proposed innovations and to provide for dissemination of the educational changes from the target school to other schools with enrollments totaling at least 2,000 pupils.

Like other programs sponsored by the Office, the network also emphasizes citizen involvement in educational planning and the decision-making process. A planning council composed of representatives from the central administrative office, school board, staff, students (where appropriate), and citizens was required for each participating district. A network advisory group composed of representatives of the local planning councils and OSPI staff was also established to work with the state superintendent's office. A selection and review committee with members from public and private organizations was set up to screen and evaluate project proposals and name schools for the network.

A first step in implementing the INSD statewide was a broad program of dissemination. Stories in the mass media, articles in professional journals, including the Office's Illinois Education News, presentations at meetings - all were utilized. Districts selected to participate were also urged to "bring their

communities and staffs along" through organized programs of dissemination.

Program improvements were to be implemented in the ten target schools in the fall of 1973, with each district to receive a $25,000 grant. Six additional schools were to be awarded planning grants. However, the Legislature did not fund this second phase of the network. Since one of the assumptions basic to the INSD was that "funding was not critical to innovation but that replanning priorities and retraining teachers are," the Office has felt that continuation is imperative. Plans for the 1973-74 school year were to invite Illinois schools to submit proposals to join the network and to continue to work with the original ten districts. The OSPI is providing increased services to the ten, with emphasis upon technical assistance in individualizing instruction, community involvement, and integration of fiscal and program planning. An effort is being made to coordinate the flow of special funds such as those available under the Right to Read; Title III, ESEA; and Title III, NDEA to these schools.

Again, it is too early for a definitive evaluation of the network project. However, there is a feeling that the Office is "pulling together some of the fragmentation that could otherwise exist" and that schools involved in the comprehensive planning effort are being assisted to use their own internal resources - "teachers, community, funds - in better ways than ever before." Staff working in the project are also of the opinion that the Office is exercising more influence with local districts because they are "staying in touch, writing, calling, presenting information to boards, administrators, and planning councils."

INSERVICE

With its emphasis upon teacher retraining as a factor in educational change, the Office of the State Superintendent for Public Instruction provides leadership for and cooperates in numerous inservice programs for local schools. For example,

a series of workshops on individualized instruction was jointly sponsored by the Office and Illinois Association of School Administrators in the summer of 1973. Each of the two-day workshops had from 75 to 100 participants, primarily teachers. A series of ten 30-minute videotape programs on innovative programs in Illinois, produced by the Office, has been widely used in teacher workshops. Ordinarily requests for inservice on a county-wide or district-wide basis are initiated by the local education agency. However, consultants working with schools in the planning process or in the Illinois Network for School Development may identify the need for inservice in some area.

PRINTED MATERIALS

A massive program of printed material disseminates information about and is supportive of both ongoing and special projects and activities of the state superintendent's office. Designed for a variety of audiences and for a variety of purposes, the materials are coordinated by the Media Services Department. Although it does not publish curriculum bulletins as such, the OSPI does print a number of position papers and guidelines, such as the one on individualized instruction. Many publications are related to missions and objectives of the Office, such as Action Goals for Seventies, An Agenda for Illinois Education. Other bulletins are designed to assist teachers - for example, the manuals to accompany the instructional television programs. Publications may be developed by Office specialists or by experts. They may result from the work of advisory councils or be pertinent to inservice activities or conferences. Editorial assistance is provided by writers assigned to Media Services. Because of the extent of the publication program, it has been necessary to establish printing priorities; materials contributing to the Action Goals are given top ranking. Distribution of bulletins varies. However, superintendents of local schools and educational service regions receive all materials and usually anyone requesting a bulletin

may get it.

A major publication is the Illinois Education News, which is published monthly except December, April, and July. Supported by both state and federal funds, the tabloid has a circulation of some 170,000 with the mailing list including both public school educators and lay citizens. It is mailed directly to home addresses. The newspaper serves to disseminate information about the OSPI and about important education concerns of a general nature. It also provides a vehicle for reprints of such documents as the Superintendent's State of Education Message, an annual report on public school education in Illinois, and Action Goals. Topics to be covered in the paper are identified through an inter-division council which meets at the first of each month and includes representatives of the office of the special assistant to the superintendent for community relations, the associate superintendent for pupil and professional services, the assistant superintendent for media services, and staff writers who will handle the stories. The associate superintendent "goes over articles"before the newspaper is sent to the commercial printer. Only two years old, the newspaper has not been formally evaluated, although awards from national press associations are indicative of the quality of its writing and layout. There is consensus that the newspaper has "put the Office in contact with school districts."

The Illinois Journal is a quarterly, funded by the state, and published by the Office. Material for the Journal is solicited from the general community - educators, students, citizens - although it is edited by an OSPI staff member.

Special publications put out by the Office vary. For example, The Washington Education Perspective, prepared by the Department of Federal Relations, is published weekly during legislative sessions. Five thousand copies of Forces

for Change in Illinois Schools, which features Title III, ESEA projects, were distributed.

AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

A fully equipped television studio, supported by a combination of state and federal funds, is also available. Although the OSPI is not responsible for operating the statewide network of educational television, it does produce or distribute approximately 50 percent of the programming. As a staff member said, "The OSPI provides the delivery system for getting programs to schools." An ITV council, composed of managers of educational television stations, deans of education, superintendents of educational service regions, and staff from the OSPI previews and selects the programs to be broadcast. Again, in developing programs, the Office gives emphasis to statewide priorities and the Action Goals.

Films and slide tape presentations are also used by the OSPI in disseminating information about educational programs or concerns. Some of these are developed internally; others are contracted. A series of five films featuring innovative programs in Illinois is currently under development by a contractor. One film was shown at the What's Right with Education conference in the summer of 1973; other conferences will also use the films.

CONFERENCES AND DISPLAYS

Highlighting promising practices, conferences are also a planned part of the Office's dissemination program. Staff responsible for Title III, ESEA consider "conferences our biggest dissemination activity". Success of "Alternatives in Education," a conference in which the Office participated in 1972, prompted the OSPI to sponsor a "What's Right with Education" conference in the summer of 1973. Programs to be spotlighted at these meetings were recommended and

screened by Office consultants. The purpose of "What's Right with Education" was to give "educators a chance to share ideas and experiences which might prove valuable in the operation of their school districts." Invited to the conference were superintendents of local districts and educational service regions. No formal evaluation of these "promising programs conferences" has been undertaken, although attendance has been considered significant and staff are watching to see if project proposals submitted this year reflect ideas or practices featured.

Different from but closely related to these activities are the educational exhibits and displays which the Office develops. Some are shown at professional meetings and conferences; others at county or state fairs.

Two mobile vans, purchased from state funds, are a component of this program. The responsibility of the office of the special assistant to the superintendent for community relations, the vans feature publications or show films and videotapes. During the summer of 1973, these units were at 20 county fairs, always with someone from the Office present to answer questions and to encourage visitors to take the printed materials. The newsprint edition of Action Goals was widely distributed in this way. These mobile displays offer staff an opportunity to focus public attention upon one program such as the Illinois Network for School Development.

The OSPI also sponsors an exhibit at the Illinois State Fair which features student projects. Over 10,000 people viewed the 1973 display.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTER

In June 1965, the Illinois Legislature appropriated funds to establish "an educational materials coordinating unit for handicapped children", with

inservice training of all professional personnel associated with programs of special education included as a major purpose of the unit. A federal grant has also contributed to the program. Currently there are five centers in the state: one in the Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction, one in the Chicago area, and three in institutions of higher education. In addition to instructional materials for exceptional children (in Illinois these children include the gifted and the educationally disadvantaged as well as the handicapped), the center in the OSPI also has ERIC resources, professional journals, a film library, and "handout material" prepared by the staff. Special resources available include a catalog of teacher made instructional materials, resource files of program people, a professional skills directory, and under development, a file of promising practices for exceptional children. A unique feature of the program, regional teams for exceptional children operate as field agents to disseminate information. The IMC responds to approximately ten requests for information a week, primarily sending out ERIC hardcopy, books, and abstracts.

Staff feel that the National Dissemination Project, originated by the National Center for Educational Communications and continued by the National Institute of Education, provided the "impetus for the coordination of materials at the OSPI." With the resources available, the unit believes it "should reach more people, but the staff is too limited." One staff member reported that "we haven't advertised our service too heavily because we don't have staff to handle any increase in requests."

INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

Dissemination is considered an "in-house" matter too. Both face-to-face contact and print are used to inform staff. The superintendent's special assistants and the four associate superintendents meet weekly to discuss and recommend policy. Approximately twice a month the superintendent meets with them. Each

associate superintendent meets weekly with his assistant superintendents with a full divisional staff meeting scheduled once a month. Four times a year all employees meet away from the Office for a half day with the state superintendent chairing the meeting. Once a month staff from the director level up (some 72) each prepare a written report on projects which is channelled directly to the superintendent. If a lack of coordination becomes apparent through these reports, the superintendent alerts the policy committee to the potential problem area. The Public Information office is responsible for two internal publications: This Week, a brief report of acts and anecdotes, and OSPI News, a monthly publication usually featuring an in depth exploration of some topic of concern to staff.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

To "make sure that dissemination activities do not stop with educators," the OSPI has "an extremely active public information program." Responsibility for the program is assigned to a special assistant reporting directly to the superintendent. Indicative of the scope of the public information activities is the fact that early in September 1973, 106 news releases had been written since the first of the year. To ensure office-wide coverage in these releases, each of the four writers in the unit is assigned to one of the OSPI divisions. Also assigned to the Public Information unit is preparation of a weekly column by the superintendent which is sent, "camera ready", to newspapers across the state. A sampling of recent columns shows one on individualized instruction, one on school energy needs, and one on financing public school education. The unit's clipping service indicates that news releases are widely used, although the extent of the use of the superintendent's column had not been determined. A weekly taped "OSPI Reports" sent to some 500 radio stations in the 1972-73 school year has been discontinued because of lack of funds. Support for public

information activities is primarily from Title V, ESEA.

SUMMARY

Three basic principles provide direction for the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction: 1) the Office should provide statewide leadership for educational change; 2) community involvement and local planning are key elements in bringing about educational improvement; and 3) information must flow from the Office to its many publics - educators and lay citizens - and from these groups to the Office. A commitment to dissemination in its broadest sense is reflected in OSPI programs and activities.

IOWA

BACKGROUND

A state of some 2.8 million people, Iowa has approximately 660,000 pupils in its 451 school districts. Better than 80 percent of these districts are located in what may be classified as rural areas - areas with fewer than five thousand inhabitants. However, in the 1972-73 school year, the ten largest districts in the state, or 2 percent of the total, enrolled 28 percent of the pupils. At the same time, the 131 smallest districts, approximately one fourth of the total number, had only 2 percent of the pupils. Although enrollments in general are declining, the number of larger districts, those with more than three thousand pupils, has increased slightly in recent years.

Approximately 97.5 percent of Iowa's pupils are classified as "white". Those classified as "Indian", representing .2 percent of the total, and as "Black", 1.7 percent, are the largest minority groups. Pupils from minority groups are found primarily in urban areas, with 70.2 percent attending school in the six largest districts. More than 39,000 professionals were employed in the states' schools in 1972-73.

Total expenditures for public school education in Iowa in 1971-72 were $602,849,967. Approximately 34 percent of the funds were from state sources; slightly more than 3 percent were Federal. State support for public school education has increased rapidly in recent years.

The Department of Public Instruction is responsible for public education, kindergarten through twelfth grade; vocational rehabilitation; and certain post-secondary programs and institutions. The policy-making body for the

department is the State Board of Public Instruction composed of nine members appointed by the Governor for six-year terms. Administrative responsibilities for the department are vested in the State Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed by the Board, subject to approval by the State Senate, for a term of four years. The deputy state superintendent shares administrative duties with the superintendent. An administrative assistant and a two-member administrative support services unit also assist the superintendent in performance of his duties. In addition, an information and publication services unit reports directly to the deputy.

Responsibilities for administering the department program are further delegated to six associate superintendents, who head the branches known as Administration, Planning and Management Information, Instruction and Professional Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Area Schools and Career Education, and Rehabilitation Education and Services. In all, the Department of Public Instruction has approximately 750 personnel; approximately 150 of the professional staff and 100 of the supportive staff have responsibilities related to public education.

There has been a trend toward regionalization of state educational services in Iowa in recent years. With the advent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the state elected to use its Title II monies to provide regional media centers. Utilizing a regional structure inaugurated in 1963, the department established 16 Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA) to provide media and other services to local schools. This regional organization is not only the vehicle for delivery of many state services but it also provides for an information and feedback network. For example, Project INFORMS, a major dissemination activity of the department, utilizes the structure to link its services to users.

Recent years have seen a shifting in the role of the department from a primary concern with regulation to a focus upon leadership and service activities. Legislation during these years has also tended to lessen the department's regulatory impact. Lengthening of the time that a school must be on the "warned" status before state approval is withdrawn is a case in point. State aid may flow only to schools meeting the minimum standards set by the Board of Public Instruction and approved by the Legislature. However, by statute, approval may not be withdrawn until a school has had ample time to remedy weaknesses. No schools at present in Iowa are in the "unapproved" category. As the trend toward service-leadership accelerates, what one staff member termed the "old inspector image" must be dispelled. The department is making "every effort to reach out and serve as a leader" and dissemination of information is seen as a "prime facet of these efforts".

CHANGE STRATEGIES

The state superintendent is committed to "widespread involvement of people in decision-making" as a key to educational change. He sees the need for some overall mechanism to get more citizen input into the decision-making process. Periodic meetings of the State Board of Public Instruction in areas across the state is one strategy being employed to open communication channels. These meetings provide a forum for hearing the concerns of educational and lay groups.

A second strategy for change is Iowa's involvement in the Individually Guided Education program. In the "only leadership pattern of its kind in the nation", the DPI is working with Iowa State University in implementing IGE in 70 schools in 35 districts. With its emphasis upon local determination of the media to be used in the personalized instruction program, IGE reflects the department's belief that state education agency leadership should focus upon management and

process with decisions concerning materials left to the school district. Although no money has been allocated to schools piloting the program the department does provide the inservice training for the facilitators in each "league". A "league" is composed of six to ten schools working together in the program. In turn, in what was termed the "ripple effect", the facilitator trains teachers in the league schools. This year emphasis is upon programs for five to nine year old pupils. It is anticipated that the program will move upward until all pupils in the pilot schools are involved in IGE.

In a third strategy for change, the Department of Public Instruction operates on the premise that state education agency "leadership [can] ...improve education ...through development of information programs." The department supports a number of such programs, some with Federal funds, some through a combination of state and Federal monies. Project INFORMS, Regional Education Service Agencies, and an active publication program are a few of them. Thrusts of these programs vary, although there is some agreement in emphasis. In the late sixties, 11 "Imperatives for Education in Iowa 1970-75" were identified by the department, including such priorities as "strong programs of education and service for children of prekindergarten and early childhood age" and "strong programs of education and service for children and adults requiring special kinds of instruction". Through the years, an effort has been made to acquaint Iowans with these imperatives. For example, every packet of bulletins sent out in response to requests also includes a copy of a brief brochure outlining these needs of education. While there has been no official action to focus departmental programs on a limited number of these imperatives, the state superintendent has informally identified three as of major concern: career education, early childhood education, and education of the profoundly handicapped. Information and technical assistance relating to these and other educational programs and practices

flow to Iowa educators through a number of dissemination activities.

INFORMATION CENTERS: PROJECT INFORMS

Funded by the Federal government, the Iowa Network for Obtaining Resource Materials for Schools (Project INFORMS) is housed in the educational media section of the department. Services of the project are carried out through volunteer field agents, "information linkers," in 11 of the state's Regional Education Service Agencies. Major resources available to teachers and others through INFORMS are 1) documents in the ERIC system, 2) articles listed in the Current Index to Journals in Education, 3) packets from the series Putting Research into Educational Practice (PREP), 4) names of consultants from a "people resource file" including specialists in the department who might be of assistance, and 5), not fully developed, a file of promising educational practices in Iowa. Being compiled by the department's planning, research and evaluation section, the data bank on promising practices currently includes evaluated Title III projects and projects identified by curriculum consultants and regional supervisors as being exemplary. In addition, schools operating in the statewide Individually Guided Education project and others are also included. Information on these promising practices in general follows the format used by the ALERT system, including the name of the person to contact for additional information, background on the project, such as type of students for whom designed, resources required, and the like. The department has contracted with the University of Iowa for two staff members to gather information for the file. It is anticipated that the catalogue of promising practices will be an increasingly important resource available to Iowa educators through INFORMS.

Two years old, the project has been fully operational since October 1972 only.

During these ten months, INFORMS has responded to almost one thousand requests for information ranging from those requiring a full computer search of all resources to those requiring no more than simple location of an article. Packets sent to those seeking information, "requestors", contain abstracts from the ERIC file, hardcopy or periodical materials if available. If unavailable, the CIJE citation will contain a notation about where the article may be secured. (The state "traveling library" has been especially helpful as a resource where journals might be obtained.) Names of consultants, an evaluation form, and a letter with a general explanation of the contents of the packet are also included.

Two basic rules govern responses to all requests involving computer searches: 1) follow up services are provided, and 2) appropriate staff in the DPI are informed of the request, including the name and location of the person asking for information and the topic of the concern. The purpose of the follow up is two-fold: to assist the person to make maximum use of the packet and to determine the effectiveness of the response - has it met the requester's needs? Is additional information desired or required?

Field agents, the primary linker of information and user, are an integral component of INFORMS, although no salaries are included in the project budget. Each of these agents performs information consultant responsibilities as an "add on" duty to a full-time assignment in a Regional Education Service Agency. Named by county superintendents or the person heading up RESA activities, the field agents were trained for their linking roles by the Far West Laboratory. They serve as contacts for local school people within their regions who request information, negotiating the question and forwarding it to the central INFORMS staff at the Department of Public Instruction for coding for the computer.

They also keep records of all requests, and, in some areas, take the packet of information to the requester. All do some follow up, if nothing more than a telephone call to see if there are any questions about the information. The INFORMS project director reports that when the field agents were first involved in information activities, they considered their duties "a burden". Now "they see them as a service."

Some RESAs have carried out active campaigns to publicize the information service, issuing special INFORMS brochures and flyers to all teachers and other educators in their regions. All RESAs publishing newsletters have, at various times, also included stories on INFORMS. One regional brochure notes that

> We have the staff, resources and dissemination facility to provide you with current information... As you evaluate your present program or think about possible curricular or administrative changes for the future, we suggest that we can be of great service to you.

Meriting special mention is what has been described as "the tremendous relationship which exists between INFORMS and the entire Department of Public Instruction." A component of the ecucational media section, INFORMS works in close cooperation with the departmental professional library, which is also assigned to this unit. Professional books, an extensive periodical collection, and a large selection of curriculum materials, catalogued and easily accessible, are useful resources for INFORMS. While no state money has been specifically earmarked for INFORMS, a number of staff services are supplied to the project. With the third year of Federal funding ending in June 1974, ways to continue the project are being explored. However, the current educational finance situation in Iowa may be indicative of very limited state resources being available.

Evaluation to date of INFORMS has been primarily quantitative. However, the rapid growth in requests and the number of repeat requests both appear favorable.

In addition, follow up activities have provided some indication of the impact of the information upon educational change.

PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY

Another activity to strengthen staff members' information base is of long standing. The department has maintained a professional library for consultants and open, to some extent to educators in the state, for a number of years. The part-time librarian (the DPI consultant assigned Title II responsibilities) believes that a full-time librarian would increase the effectiveness of the service immeasurably. Again, however, funding for such a staff member appears doubtful.

PRINT MATERIALS

A second major dissemination effort is a very active program providing publications of a variety of kinds to various audiences. Dating from the thirties is the department's commitment to a statewide newsletter. Begun as the Education Bulletin as a means of communication with county superintendents, Iowa's DPI Dispatch currently has a circulation of 57,000, including members of local school boards, administrators, teachers, teacher aides, members of advisory groups, and others. The Dispatch is mailed in bulk to the central office of each school district, which, in turn, distributes it to individual campuses. Prior to 1970, the newsletter, which is published seven times during each school year, was primarily the vehicle for legal and administrative items. Currently, emphasis is upon program information and the Dispatch is seen as a major link to teachers. The responsibility of the information and publications unit, the newsletter "reaches out to teachers with features on what's happening in classrooms across the state." Programs and practices which merit statewide

dissemination are identified by departmental consultants, with the articles about them written by members of the information staff. Each issue during the past year emphasized a central topic such as career education or environmental education. For the 1973-74 school year staff have identified four major themes- early childhood education, Individually Guided Education, special education, and adult education - to be highlighted. The Dispatch is supported by state funds.

In addition to this general newsletter, 22 other newsletters are published by the department. Although there is no mechanism for coordinating their content, there is some coordination of format. The majority of the newsletters follow a design which makes possible immediate identification of the publication as one issued by the DPI. Editorial and design assistance is available from information services if requested, and production is coordinated by the same unit.

Reflecting the department's belief that there is "a need for specialists to talk to other specialists", these newsletters are targeted for such diverse audiences as English teachers, adult educators, Title I personnel, and cafeteria workers. Content in many is primarily administrative, but others include a great deal of program information designed to develop awareness of promising practices. For example, "A Challenge to Change", published six times a year by the urban education section for the 22 largest districts in Iowa, features activities which seem to be working in dealing with desegregation. The part-time disseminator in the unit, who may use services in the information unit in editing the publication, collects the information for the articles through on-site visits.

Curriculum bulletins are also a component of Iowa's printed dissemination. Once highly prescriptive, these bulletins now emphasize process and "good

approaches", and "concepts which can be adapted to units of work". Developed under departmental leadership by groups of educators which include teachers, curriculum bulletins are distributed through local superintendents.

Evaluation of printed materials varies. When a change in the Education Bulletin was contemplated, a questionnaire was mailed to some two thousand educators to find out what people really wanted. The DPI Dispatch with a change in format and content, resulted from this survey. No formal evaluation of the Dispatch has been undertaken. However, informal evaluation can be inferred from some of the specialized features of the newsletter. For example, most issues contain what staff identify as "ads". These include such information as recent publications, dates of professional meetings, and proposed workshops. A response form is provided for securing the bulletins, registering for the meetings, or indicating preferences for topics for a workshop. Some five thousand bulletins were requested during the past year from these "ads". Plans are being made for a more formal evaluation of the Dispatch during the 1973-74 school year. Informal evaluation of some of the targeted newsletters has taken the form of feedback secured from professional meetings and the like.

FACE TO FACE COMMUNICATION

Further recognition of the importance of feedback from practitioners is exemplified in the Superintendent's Advisory Council and Coordinating Committee. Begun in 1963, the Council forms the network for a two-way flow of communication, including both administrative information and information about educational needs and programs.

The superintendents within each of the state's regions meet together regularly as a group. Each group elects a chairman and secretary. Chairmen of the 16 areas make up the Advisory Council. The Coordinating Committee, which meets

with the Council, is made up of representatives of professional organizations and the four Iowa institutions of higher education with graduate programs in education. "Over the years a number of innovations have been moved into Iowa schools" through the Advisory Council and Coordinating Committee "as problems have been identified in the field" and information about solutions and the inservice necessary for incorporating the new programs has flowed back to practitioners.

The Council meets monthly with the state superintendent and his key staff. Members may bring to these meetings area problems and concerns. Departmental personnel may bring the latest information about instructional and administrative trends and practices. Immediately following each meeting, Council members report back to the superintendents in their regions. Indicative of value placed upon the network is the fact that administrators said they would pay their own travel expenses, currently funded through Title V, ESEA, if that were the only way they could maintain this important link with the DPI.

In addition to this opportunity for face to face communication and dissemination, the Department of Public Instruction has cooperated in some conferences designed to bring innovative and exemplary programs to the attention of teachers. Education Bazaar, cosponsored with Iowa State University and teacher organizations, illustrates what was described as "dissemination at an elementary level." The Bazaar, which attracted approximately 700 educators in the spring of 1973, featured some eight to ten Title III projects. Each of these had been in operation at least two years, was of concern to a broad general group of teachers, and, in the opinion of the staff making the selection, "had something to exhibit."

There has also been an attempt to encourage visitation to validated Title III and Title I projects "that are working" as a means of encouraging the spread

of promising practices, but no formal program has been developed.

Evaluation of conferences has been based upon questionnaires completed at the close of the activity, with little or no evidence collected concerning long-range impact. Currently, however, a study is being conducted in schools adopting one of the state's validated Title III projects to determine how people first learned of it. It is hoped that information gathered will assist in identifying the "best medium for reaching potential adaptors/adopters."

AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

Iowa views audiovisual materials, especially films, as "a definite dissemination device". With film libraries established in each Regional Education Service Agency with funds from Title II, ESEA, the state made media available to districts which many schools could not afford. There is a feeling that if Federal support for media were withdrawn, the regional media libraries might "survive for two or three years before their film collections were seriously out of date." According to the state superintendent, there are constraints upon state expenditures for education which might make it illegal for these funds to be used in the regional media centers.

A number of other audiovisual materials - films and slide-tape presentations - have been developed or made available by various department units to "tell people about their schools" or to explain some educational program.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

Finally, undergirding department dissemination efforts are a public information program and activities to strengthen internal communication. The DPI has long issued a weekly news release to "remind people that the Department of Public Instruction is here". Special news releases are also used from time to time.

Little emphasis is placed upon radio and television as a means of reaching the general public. A weekly newsletter keeps staff informed on major department programs. Weekly meetings of the superintendent and his top staff and monthly general staff meetings are also seen in the context of internal communication. Title V, ESEA, has provided the support for the public information program and for the staff newsletter.

SUMMARY

The Iowa Department of Public Instruction is involved in a number of activities designed to encourage education change. Ranging from participation in a piloting of IGE in a limited number of Iowa schools to providing information from research and other studies to educators, these efforts reflect the attitude of the department that educational needs must be determined at the local level. Coupled with this is a strong belief that the state must provide the leadership and service to encourage local action.

MICHIGAN

Michigan's 2.2 million public school pupils attend school in some 608 districts. Of these districts, 529 offer a full kindergarten through twelfth grade program; 74 are non-high school districts. In this highly industrialized state, 35 school districts each have more than 10,000 pupils enrolled while another 177 have between 2,500 and 9,999 pupils. However, 113 districts have fewer than 500 pupils each. Michigan also has 58 intermediate units serving these schools.

In 1971-72, 84.6 percent of Michigan's pupils were classified as "white"; 13.6 as "Negro"; and 1.4 percent as "Spanish-surnamed." Pupils identified as American Indian and Oriental represented .5 percent of the total. The percentage of minority pupils in schools increased from 1970-71 to 1971-72 while the percentage of "white" pupils declined. Minority pupils are concentrated in urban centers with these pupils comprising nearly half of the total enrollment in areas with 50,000 or more population.

Staffing the schools for Michigan's pupils are approximately 160,000 instructional and non-instructional personnel.

In 1970-71 public school expenditures in the state were $2,332,764,086, of which approximately 51 percent was from local sources, approximately 43 percent from state sources, and approximately 6 percent from Federal sources.

Until the middle Thirties the state department of education was, according to some staff members, "very directive", prescribing courses of study, etc. Following "reaction to such measures", there was rapid growth in local control

and the department assumed a more passive role in public school education. With the reorganization of the state's management of education in the early Sixties, there was a "dramatic change" in the department's position. By the late Sixties the department was advocating certain procedures, accountability, for example, and a service orientation had developed with emphasis upon technical assistance to local and intermediate units. Adoption of a new constitution provided the impetus for these changes.

Under the constitution an eight-member elected State Board of Education was established, with responsibility for appointing a State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The Constitution of 1963 mandates that

> Leadership and general supervision over all public education, including adult education and instructional programs in state institutions...is vested in a State Board of Education. It shall serve as the general planning and coordinating body for all public education, including higher education, and shall advise the Legislature as to the financial requirements in connection therewith.

To expedite delivery of Board of Education services to schools and citizens of Michigan, the Department of Education, the administrative arm of the Board, is organized into 13 major "service areas": 1) General Education, 2) Special Education, 3) Compensatory Education, 4) School Management, 5) Research, Evaluation and Assessment, 6) Student Financial Assistance, 7) Vocational Education, 8) Adult and Continuing Education, 9) Teacher Education, 10) Higher Education Planning and Coordination, 11) State Library, 12) Rehabilitation, and 13) Department Services. The top management team, in addition to the state superintendent, includes a deputy superintendent, an executive assistant to the superintendent, an assistant superintendent for School and Community

Affairs, and four associate superintendents: one for School Program Development, one for Research and School Administration, one for Higher Education and Adult Continuing Education, and one for Business and Finance (State Aid). There is also an administrative secretary to the State Board of Education.

MAJOR CHANGE STRATEGY

Under the leadership of the superintendent and his administrative team, major effort has been devoted in recent years to development of an Accountability Model for Michigan public schools. Believing that "accountability...can trigger a quiet revolution," the superintendent views the model as providing a rational approach to change. A number of factors gave rise to the development of this strategy. Among them were negotiations legislation which gave teachers bargaining power, "tremendous growth in expenditures for education with no evidence of any improvement in student performance because of increased costs", and problems associated with desegregation, isolation, and compensatory education. Coupled with these was the growing concern for what the state was getting for its educational dollar.

The Accountability Model is built around what the superintendent has described as the "three box theory." The first box, primarily the responsibility of the state, should contain the performance objectives - the expectations for what "schooling is supposed to do for each child." The second box, primarily the responsibility of the local district, should contain the "delivery systems... for acquiring the expectations in the first box." The state has two roles in the filling of this box: to flow money into districts to change the present delivery systems and to provide information and technical assistance which can lead to installation of promising practices. The third box should contain the teacher preparation and professional development necessary to train the kinds

of teachers who can use performance objectives, who have the management skills to handle new delivery systems, and who have the appropriate content and child growth and development knowledge and understandings. According to the superintendent, filling this third box, which is so crucial to improvement in education, must be based upon, must develop, from the contents of the first box.

In short, "it is the job of the state education agency to look at the end product; it is up to the local district to select the means of achieving the end product." The state will not "tell the school how to spend its money; it will ask the school how the money was spent." The Accountability Model should lead "to a guarantee that every child who comes through the Michigan school system has not only achieved the basic skills of learning, but is also prepared to earn a living."

This key strategy for change in Michigan has been four years in development. Both state and Federal funds have contributed to the process. Title V, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has been used by the Department of Education to fund the effort internally. At the same time, state monies for compensatory education and performance contracting have flowed to local schools for programs based upon the concept of accountability.

Prior to and along with development of the model, department staff members have written position papers detailing "State Board of Education philosophy and policy in regard to 29 different educational issues and problems - from secondary education to desegregation." Widely disseminated, these have provided a frame of reference.

With a department-wide commitment, activities across the agency have focused upon development and implementation of the model. Staff from various units

have been involved in one or more aspects of each of its six basic steps:

1. Identification of Common Goals of Michigan Education
2. Development of performance objectives
3. Assessment of needs
4. Analysis of delivery systems
5. Evaluation of programs
6. Recommendations for improvement

The first step has been accomplished at the state level. Developed by a representative group of Michigan citizens and discussed throughout the state in public hearings, the Common Goals of Michigan Education were approved by the State Board of Education in 1971. For full implementation of the Accountability Model at the local level, school districts are "encouraged to examine their educational systems and adopt a set of appropriate educational goals."

Michigan is well into step two. Performance objectives are currently being developed from the statements of goals in priority skill areas such as communication skills, mathematics, science, social studies, fine arts, health education, physical education, and occupational skills. Developed under leadership of the department by educators from school districts and universities, the objectives are reviewed and revised, "validated" by commissions appointed by the State Board of Education. These commissions are made up of educators, lay citizens, and students. Like the Common Goals, performance objectives are not intended to be all inclusive. Local schools may wish to expand them to meet their particular needs. Performance objectives in reading and mathematics, grades kindergarten through six, have gone the full cycle from development and validation to adoption by the State Board of Education. As other performance objectives are completed, they will be submitted to the commissions for validation and then to the Board for official adoption.

At the same time, activities are being directed toward step three. Again under

departmental leadership, teachers in districts volunteering to participate have designed test items for each of the performance objectives in reading and mathematics. Refined with assistance from a technical contractor, these items are the basis for statewide needs assessment using objectives - referenced tests for fourth and seventh grade pupils. Local districts too will assess their pupils' needs in terms of performance objectives whether they have adopted the state objectives or have developed their own.

A number of state Department of Education activities are basic to step four, the step most closely associated with what has traditionally been termed "dissemination." With information from needs assessment, Michigan schools will be in a position to identify delivery systems requiring change. The department is making a variety of alternative solutions available from both state and local funds, including performance contracting, compensatory education, promising practices from experimental and demonstration schools, year-round schooling, intensified preschool education, improvement of nutrition through school meals, inservice training of teachers, career education, neighborhood educational facilities, and alternative occupational scheduling.

Input for step five is being provided by departmental evaluation activities. Professional development is an integral component of this step. High priority has been given to identification of inservice programs that seem to have made a difference in performance of pupils. It is anticipated that model inservice programs based upon elements of those that have been proven to be effective will be funded in the future. Local schools will implement this step by evaluating their programs.

In step six as recommendations for change based on data from previous steps come to or originate with local districts and the State Board of Education,

they will be studied in terms of the goals established and the cycle will continue.

While the state has moved forward on the Accountability Model, it has not been implemented within local districts. Currently the model is being field-tested in a limited number of elementary and secondary schools. Two years ago the state superintendent began meeting with 11 elementary schools. Secondary schools were added in the 1973-74 school year. These schools have volunteered to apply the accountability process to their own operation. At the beginning of the pilot test, each elementary school was asked to determine what it wanted to accomplish in terms of overall goals for pupils; each teacher was asked to develop specific and measurable student behavior objectives. The superintendent reports that teachers felt "they weren't trained to do what they were being asked to do and their educational system wasn't designed to do what it was being asked to do." As a result of this pilot experience, the state has taken the lead in developing performance objectives and in providing money to change the delivery system..

MAJOR STRATEGIES FOR DISSEMINATION

In moving districts toward accountability, the State Board of Education early sought incentives from the Legislature in terms of funds for programs based upon the concept; State Aid for Compensatory Education and Performance Contracting were enacted. Under the compensatory program eligible districts can receive up to $200 per pupil - money which is over and above the districts' state support for general education. To receive the full amount, districts must meet performance objectives which they have set for their disadvantaged pupils. Sixty-seven districts were qualified by the department on the basis of data extrapolated from the statewide assessment of fourth and seventh grade pupils.

During the first two years of the program districts were not penalized for not attaining the performance objectives set for their pupils. However, preliminary data for the third year show that not all districts had met their objectives so there will be some cut-back in their state compensatory money.

The State Performance Contracting Program also has a built in accountability feature, with pupil-achievement measured on pre-determined goals. If the pupils do not succeed, the contracts provide that the teaching agency - in some instances educational firms, in others, local teachers - does not receive the payment specified in the contractual agreement. Four of five performance contracts awarded during the 1972-73 school year proved to be effective and are being continued.

Widespread implementation of the Accountability Model will also depend upon a massive program of information dissemination. A first step has been to make educators and others aware of the model through news releases, publications, workshops, a film (estimated to have been seen by 25 percent of the educators in the state), and presentations at professional meetings. To increased understanding of the concept, both school people and lay citizens have been involved from the beginning in developing the model. However, as one staff member noted, "dissemination is hard in a state like Michigan." In remote rural areas, workshops may not attract as many as desired. Publications may not reach the intended audience. Lack of information may lead to misapprehensions about the nature of accountability. To further understanding of accountability as "a way to help schools help themselves," the department is emphasizing the identification and dissemination of effective programs which utilize elements of the concept. For example, the department may concentrate in the next two years upon "finding districts which are using performance objectives and are

making significant pupil gains." Staff members would go into these districts to analyze "how they are doing it." Once validated, these programs would be made highly visible. A departmental publication summarizes it this way: "Program validation and dissemination is an activity which attempts to assure future consumers that projects that have been judged effective to do what they purport to do."

A major component of the dissemination strategy is the department's Experimental and Demonstration Centers Program. Through this effort the Department of Education allocates funds for the development of alternative delivery systems. Built upon the premise that experimentation and demonstration are "necessary conditions for improvement and change," the program is designed to help schools "discover the most effective system for delivering their services to children and youth." It is supported by funds available from both state and Federal sources, including State Performance Contracting and Special Projects (among these are the schools piloting the Accountability Model and a program on developing performance objectives in the affective domain) and Title III, ESEA. Federal vocational money for experimental and exemplary projects is also to be coordinated with the program. When fully operational, the effort will encompass two networks - one made up of experimental programs, the second of demonstration centers. Grants for planning, developmental, experimental, and demonstration projects are available through the program. Criteria for each are progressively more rigorous. For example, experimental programs must be set up in such a way that meaningful data can be gathered and conclusions drawn. Demonstrations are built upon successful experimental projects. These are to be projects ready to be disseminated.

Because the department "wants to be in the dissemination business in terms of

programs, but only with hard substantive data," validation of program results is crucial. Staff members go in and check conditions under which the evaluation was carried out. When the department is satisfied that the "evaluation was sound and that the program did make a difference in kids," concerted efforts are made to disseminate the information. Some effective programs may be invited to become demonstration centers. In other instances personal contact may be the vehicle for moving a program from one location to another: a school may be told, "Here's a program you may be interested in; if you adopt it, you should get similar results." A publication is also used to spread the word about the E & D program. The 1973-74 Current Project Report not only describes the program and procedures for applying for grants but also features detailed descriptions of projects, including for most data such as type of project, objectives, activities, evaluation, and recommendations. No demonstration centers are included among the 61 projects in the current publication.

ADDITIONAL DISSEMINATION STRATEGIES

Face to Face communcation

A number of advisory groups also serve a communication-dissemination function, providing input to departmental decision makers from both lay citizens and practitioners and feedback to the field concerning current statewide programs and priorities. An outgrowth of a group set up about 15 years ago, one advisory group is composed of approximately 50 to 60 people representative of every organization in the state interested in education including professional associations and such groups as the Chamber of Commerce and the Farm Bureau, legislators, and representatives of large and middle-size schools.

During Legislative sessions, the Council meets weekly with the state superintendent and key staff. Aft the close of these sessions, the group meets less

frequently but continues to be an important link between the department and the educational community and concerned citizens.

Statewide conferences on major issues such as the one on career education being planned and the series of regional workshops on accountability are also integral components of dissemination.

Publications

Departmental publications are also seen as providing an "entry into local districts and intermediate units." Coordinated through the office of the assistant superintendent for legislation and public affairs, who provides editorial assistance as needed and schedules the materials for printing, publications are funded from both state and Federal sources. Currently emphasis is upon publishing the performance objectives developed for the Accountability Model. For example, 85,000 copies of the objectives in mathematics were published, including one copy for every teacher in the state whose assignment included mathematics.

Currently a quarterly, Michigan Education is a major vehicle for informing local schools. It is varied in content, with some issues treating subjects such as accountability in depth. Ten thousand copies of this departmental newsletter are distributed. MDE Report is a weekly newsletter which provides a line of communication from the state superintendent to local school administrators. Sbe action, a summary of action taken by the State Board of Education, is prepared immedately after each meeting and distributed to all superintendents and others requesting the material.

A series of booklets pertinent to the Accountability Model has been widely circulated, including the Common Goals of Michigan Education and a position statement on Education Accountability.

An annual report developed "in accordance with law and custom" is designed "to give the reader an idea of how the State Board of Education and its operational arm, the Michigan Department of Education, fits into" the educational picture. Distributed to members of the executive branch of state government, legislators, educators, and interested citizens, the report provides a readable summary of "state involvement in education" and focuses attention upon current departmental priorities.

Not much curriculum material is printed, although some program materials are developed under contract, and curriculum guidelines in areas of great "social problems, such as sex education, environment, and drugs" have been mandated.

All publications are, by policy, mailed to school superintendents and superintendents of intermediate units. There has been no formal evaluation of the impact of printed materials. However, staff note that "experience says that some superintendents make them available to teachers and principals."

Public Information

Public support for departmental efforts is sought through public information activities. Including press releases and press contacts, the program provides full coverage for State Board of Education activities and priorities.

The scope of the program can be seen in the 127 releases which have been issued from January to September 1973. A major project of the public information unit is the compilation in early September each year of educational statistics and projections. A sort of annual "state of education message from the Superintendent", the packet of information, which is sent to all news media in Michigan, provides a "broad but very brief overview of some of the issues and situations on which attention will be focused this year...information which

is intended to give the media background materials regarding all major programs administered through the Department of Education."

Although print media have received emphasis in the past, plans are being made to institute a "dial-a-phone" taped report, which will be available to anyone calling in. Featured will be one-minute summaries of important developments by key staff members.

Library services

With the state library, an integral component of the State Department of Education, a reference source is readily available to staff members. However, the library is housed in a building some distance from many of the department units. Title II, ESEA, responsibilities are assigned to the library. A number of activities are under way at the library to strengthen the information base of both department members and local school personnel, including a "current awareness file," bibliographies, ERIC files, a limited film collection, a textbook collection, some videotaping equipment, an inservice program on library services, and school media mobiles. The "current awareness file" is a monthly compilation of title pages from all educational journals, which is sent to key personnel. Any articles which staff would like to read are duplicated for them. When a budget cut eliminated this service, there were so many requests for it that it was reinstated. Five or six staff members a week request searches of the ERIC files. The staff member in charge of this service believes there is a need to educate people to the value of the resource and to encourage fuller usage. ERIC serves people in local schools through community college centers or centers in districts. If resources permitted, the state librarian would like to set up a model media center to serve both staff at the department and other educators. Such a center would include ERIC, state and Federal

documents, textbooks, a complete film collection, and other resources. Additional projections for improved services include implementation of 22 regional media centers.

Internal communication

Commitment to 1) coordination of efforts from across the department and 2) concerted attention to priority activities has resulted in a number of groups meeting regularly for the exchange of ideas. A Planning Council brings together on a weekly basis the state superintendent and his top staff. An administrative Council is composed of these staff members plus unit directors. At the monthly meetings the agenda centers upon items which should be reported to staffs. Once each three months a general meeting of all professionals hears a report from the superintendent on key issues. Composed of the directors of special education, general education, compensatory education, and vocational education, the Superintendent's Council of Services to Children and Youth meets two or three times each month. The Council provides the mechanism for seeing "if the department can't utilize all available funds in a better way." The objective of the group is "to bring about congruence in department thrusts."

SUMMARY

Activities throughout the Michigan Department of Education are directed toward one overriding goal - implementing the Accountability Model as the key strategy for bringing about educational change. Emphasis upon the model is pervasive. From "spreading the word about accountability" to providing pertinent data about effective programs, the flow of information is seen as basic to this effort. The department is searching for increasingly effective ways to communicate with the people it is trying to serve. A case in point was the attempt to secure Federal funding for a project for dissemination of information from the Michigan

Educational Assessment program. The department proposed to examine the information needs of various audiences and develop various strategies to communicate with these groups. Although the proposal was not funded, one element of it has been developed under a cooperative Federal project. However, this component is limited in scope and does not get into change strategies and decision making as the original plan did. The need for developing mechanisms for dissemination is still viewed as a high priority.

MONTANA

Fourth among the states in geographic area, Montana ranks forty-fourth in population. Both size and numbers of people have influenced development of its public school system. Of the state's 672 school districts, 184 have just one teacher; 110, two or three teachers. Only five of the state's districts are located in urban areas having populations of 20,000 or more. Although consolidations of smaller districts have occurred at an increasing rate in recent years, some are so geographically isolated that consolidation is not feasible. Of the state's population, 95.5 percent are classified as "white": .3 percent as "black"; and 4.2 percent as "other", primarily Indian. Slightly more than 170 thousand pupils are enrolled in Montana's public schools. Some 11,000 teachers, administrators, and other professional personnel staff these schools.

Like most western states Montana has a long tradition of local control of public schools. However, recognition of the state's responsibility for and commitment to education is reflected in the newly adopted state Constitution:

> It is the goal of the people to establish a system of education which will develop the full educational potential of each person. Equality of educational opportunity is guaranteed to each person in the State.

Responsibility for statewide leadership of the public educational enterprise is vested primarily in an elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction who serves a four year term. A Board of Public Education, with seven appointed and three ex officio members, shares some constitutional and statutory responsibility.

The $181.45 million revenue for public school education in Montana in 1970-71 was derived from the usual three sources - local, state, and federal - with by far the largest portion, 73 percent, supplied locally; 21.1 percent, from state sources, and 5.8 percent federal. Legislation enacted in 1973 will change this picture to some extent as a statewide property tax increases state participation somewhat.

In August of 1973, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) had 135 employees, 72 of them holding professional positions. Reporting directly to the Superintendent are two assistants and two assistant superintendents. Although the structure of the Office is currently under study, programmatic responsibilities are at present assigned to five components: 1) Financial and General Support for Schools; 2) Internal Support Services; 3) Research, Planning, Development and Evaluation; 4) Vocational and Occupational Skills; and 5) Basic Skills. Each of these components is headed by a director. The dissemination function, acknowledged by the Office as an important function, is presently dispersed throughout this structure, and coordination is accomplished primarily through monthly management meetings and through routine activities of the Information Services program. Responsibility for coordination has been assigned to the assistant to the Superintendent.

In the view of the Montana OSPI, dissemination is not confined to activities to distribute information via print or audiovisual materials; and it is "most definitely not just a package retrieved from ERIC." Rather, the Montana state education agency takes the broad view of dissemination, perceiving it as a vital component of an overall change strategy. The position of the OSPI toward dissemination can be most clearly seen in the fact that two key strategies for effecting educational change are classified by the Office as major dissemination efforts.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE

Both the School-Community Assistance Process and a series of regional workshops have been given top management priority. Both are based upon recognition that, while "curriculum change cannot be dictated," statewide leadership for education has an obligation to "encourage change." In keeping with this philosophy is a statement in the Montana accreditation manual, which reads in part

> Schools are encouraged to develop new and innovative teaching techniques, curriculum patterns, schedules and staff designs.

Both strategies for change are being developed within the context of the strong commitment to local control found in the state and the relatively large number of public school districts and the relatively small size of the state education agency staff.

School-Community Assistance Process

According to the state Superintendent, the School-Community Assistance Process, now in its second year, had its origin in the Office's longstanding concern that the accreditation process pointed out deficiences in school operation but did not provide for assistance in overcoming areas of weakness identified. After examining resources and ideas from throughout Montana and searching methods other states were using to assist local districts and their communities to build good educational programs, the Office developed its model - the School-Community Assistance Process. The Process, as it is familiarly known, is based upon the premise that "educational change can only come about if it is internalized." The key to the Process is involvement of people - both in the school and in the community. The Office views its role as facilitative, catalytic. A two or three member team from the SEA, upon invitation of the local board of school trustees, assists the district to set up school-

community structures

- to assess educational needs,
- to "harvest those needs and rank order them",
- to set goals,
- to search for alternative solutions,
- to develop plans for implementing the selected solutions, and finally,
- to implement and evaluate the programs.

Staff members from the SEA serving on Process teams are seen as "change agents" helping to make things happen, not as "doers" of "things" for school districts. When the full implication of involvement in the Process has been understood and accepted by a local school board, the team goes in and assists the district to organize structures so "things can happen." For example, the team does not conduct a needs assessment, instead, members help to get the local concerns identified, assist the district to locate or design instruments for collecting information and to analyze data, identify resources for the district, etc.

It is anticipated that an SEA team will work with a district from 9 to 18 months before the district is ready to continue efforts on its own. The aim of team activities is to develop a self-renewing capability within each participating district.

Process teams began work with 20 districts during 1972-73, spending from one to three days each month in the assigned districts. By the end of the school year, a number of Montana schools had identified educational needs and were ready, with the start of school in the fall of 1973, to develop alternative means and solutions for achieving their priority goals. It is with this step three in the Process that information, per se, will play a most important role. Here, alternatives will grow "from a careful investigation of the local and external resources available, an assessment of programs elsewhere having similar goals, and imaginative design of new program ideas."

Major attention is currently directed in the OSPI toward development of a catalogue of promising educational practices in Montana, which would be supportive of this Process step. Procedures for selecting proven programs are to be developed. Computerized information available from such sources as the Northern Colorado Board of Cooperative Services (BOCS) will also be used by team members in assisting districts to search for alternative solutions. Staff from two components of the SEA, Basic Skills and Vocational Skills, will be heavily involved in step three as they become, in essence, information linkers, identifying "people resources", curriculum materials and programs, printed information, and practices in local schools. Now confined primarily to Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, interschool vistation may also contribute to this step as teachers from a school in the Process are released to observe in schools with promising programs.

An Office-wide commitment has been made to the School-Community Assistance Process. Management at all levels - Superintendent, assistant superintendents, directors - is committed to the project. Team members, who are at the supervisory level in the OSPI organizational structure, are expected to devote one third of their time to Process involvement. SEA support is also evident in 1) staff development activities to prepare team members, 2) preparation of manuals to guide teams in each step of the Process, and 3) assignment of a full-time Process coordinator.

During the three summer months of 1972, some 50 staff members were involved in a massive inservice effort with the Northwest Regional Laboratory and OSPI staff members conducting the training sessions. Indicative of the intensity of the inservice are the 15 hours of graduate credit awarded by the University of Montana and Montana State University for successful completion

Regional Workshops

The second statewide strategy for effecting change is the series of OSPI sponsored workshops, offered for the first time prior to the opening of the 1973-74 school year. Repeated in six geographic regions of the state, the workshops reached approximately 70 percent of the state's professional school staff. In Montana accreditation standards allow each accredited school to strengthen staff competencies through inservice which can take place on official school days, Pupil Instruction Related Days. The series of workshops fit into this allowance for inservice work days.

The workshop format provided for a general session and three one and one-half hour sessions. Content of these sessions reflects needs and interests identified by teachers early in the spring of 1973 through a questionnaire in Montana Schools, the Superintendent's monthly newsletter, and through individual surveys conducted by OSPI staff in specific areas. Final selection of topics was by SEA staff in light of both teacher-perceived needs and staff knowledge and observation. Topics covered ranged from curriculum trends to new teaching techniques, methods, and media. A limited number of sessions were devoted to administrative matters.

Approximately $20,000 was committed from the Superintendent's state budget and from federal program monies to support this effort. Fees for outside consultants and for staff travel and per diem are included; however, salaries paid to SEA staff during the days of actual involvement in planning for and conducting the workshops are not reflected in that figure.

Evaluation of this sizable undertaking was conducted at the close of workshop activities and was designed to solicit feedback from both presenters and participants which will be useful in planning future workshops. Of 2,486

responding to the question "Should workshops like this be continued?" 2,076 said "yes"; 334, "maybe"; and only 76 "no." No plan has as yet been developed to secure data about long-range results of participation.

These six workshops are viewed as a first step toward development of a series of workshops to be held possibly three times each year, workshops in which the topics would both anticipate and be based upon needs identified through the School-Community Assistance Process. In addition, some staff believe that such a series of regional meetings would replace the individual workshops which are currently offered throughout the year by various program supervisors. Largely uncoordinated across components, these activities are developed by staff members as they discern the need for them. However, planning for the long-range strategy has just begun.

Just getting under way is another regional effort, whi , it is anticipated, will being services closer to local units. Through five regions established by the Governor, contracts for some special education services will be established. Based upon this initial experience, other activities may be coordinated at a later date through these regional offices.

ADDITIONAL DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Designed to strengthen education in Montana, but not necessarily related to the two major state strategies for educational change are the more traditional dissemination efforts.

Print Materials

Montana Schools reaches every professional educator - teacher and administrator - in the state. The publication places major emphasis upon administrative and procedural matters. Although it has been expanded to include program information and perspectives, it must, as one staff member indicated, at best

be "limited to spot announcements, not in depth concepts in curriculum."

A number of newsletters, each aimed at a specific target audience, such as English teachers or Title III or Title I personnel, are produced periodically. Subject area supervisors are responsible for identifying the content to be included. Editing, layout, design, and production are coordinated through the Information Services program which is attached to the Superintendent's Office and under the general supervision of an assistant to the Superintendent. These newsletters, unlike Montana Schools, which is distributed by bulk mail, are mailed directly to teachers. In keeping with the SEA policy that district superintendents are kept informed of all contacts with and information sent to staff members, newsletters are also sent to superintendents.

A variety of curriculum guides, with emphasis upon curriculum development not curriculum prescription, are also issued by the OSPI. Authorized by law, these bulletins have, in recent years, increasingly spoken to the process of curriculum building with less and less attention directed to curriculum content. Planning for and writing of these guides is seen as a joint state-local responsibility. Two methods of development are used: 1) staff members may write a bulletin and then forward it to selected teachers and others for reaction to and suggestions for modification; or 2) local school people may develop a bulletin, which is then edited by the SEA staff. In either case, to ensure maximum input from practitioners, all guides are issued first in draft copies, with final publication one year later after field reaction has been secured. It is mandatory in the Montana Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction that staff developing a curriculum guide also assume the responsibility for showing the target audience how to use the bulletin. It is interesting to note that in the view of some staff members, traditional

prescriptive curriculum guides are "the least viable dissemination techniques."

In addition to newsletters and curriculum guides, bulletins have been developed which feature various programs such as Title III, ESEA, or post-secondary vocational technical education. For example, descriptions of various Title III programs operating in schools were included in Innvoative Education, ESEA, TITLE III, Montana. No bulletin highlighting programs selected as exemplary has been published. A number of bulletins on administrative procedures and statistical reports are issued each year. In general, however, Montana's publication program is limited, indicative of the belief, perhaps, that there are "many problems not solved by paper."

Although printing is coordinated through Information Services, coordination between components of the development of bulletins is achieved on an informal basis through monthly meetings of the management team - the Superintendent, assistants, assistant superintendents, and directors.

Funds for printed materials are from various sources, with some budgeted through Internal Support Services. No formal evaluation of printed materials has been conducted.

Audiovisual Materials

Some use has been made of audiovisual materials as a method of disseminating information. For example, a film was developed approximately two years ago which presented effective innovative programs in the state, including those funded under Title III and other sources. However, no formal procedure for identification of school programs meriting statewide visibility has been developed. Some use has been made of the projects' own evaluative data, but greater weight has been given to SEA staff observation of the effectiveness of a project. Currently in the planning stage is a film to depict the School-

Community Assistance Process. Also being considered is a slide-tape or other audiovisual presentation of a recently developed curriculum guide for English, which is process oriented.

There is no one program specifically set up to assist in planning for and producing films and other audiovisual materials although, again, Information Services has a limited capacity to coordinate such efforts.

Face to Face Contact

What one staff member identified as "person to person " dissemination is an important element in the SEA's effort to get information out to users. 1) Staff consultative visits to schools, 2) a planned program of visitation limited at present to Title III projects, and 3) an annual statewide educational conference might all be classified under the program of personal contact.

Some modification in the traditional consultative visit to schools is currently under way. Schools requesting such assistance are asked to identify the specific outcome expected from the visit; SEA staff members initiating school visits are required to specify objectives for the trip. Efforts are being made to coordinate staff travel for school visits. It is hoped that the end result will be more effective utilization of staff resources.

An integral activity of the Montana Title III program has been the setting aside of state funds each year to support interschool visitation to projects. Teachers and administrators wishing to visit any project in the state may apply to the OSPI. If approved, funds are provided for travel and per diem. Under consideration is using interschool visitation in step three of the School-Community Assistance Process. If this dissemination technique is made available to Process schools, it is hoped that in addition to expense money,

monies will also be provided for teachers to substitute for those released to visit schools.

A more traditional way of reaching people is through the annual statewide conference held for educators each spring. Attendance at these meetings has been relatively good, with county superintendents meeting in conjunction with the OSPI conference.

Telephone Contact

In a state the size of Montana, what one staff member termed the "space problem" presents special challenges. The OSPI has developed one unique way of responding and is exploring additional ways of disseminating information. During the 1973 session of the Legislature, a tollfree Hotline, manned by a full time employee , was installed to answer all legal and legislative questions from school people. Initiated under Title VI, the Hotline was also supported by state funds. Approximately ten calls were received. Although no formal evaluation of the service was conducted, consensus seems to be that "school people were pleased to have it."

The Office is investigating the possibility of purchasing a number of portable sets of telephone equipment to make available to districts in the state. Making it possible for a group within a local district to hold a telephone conference with a group at the state Office, the amplifying equipment would provide for a kind of personal contact but without the necessity of staff travel to achieve it.

Public Information Program

Providing some support for other dissemination efforts is a rather low key public information program. News releases are kept to a minimum with major reliance upon the Capitol Press Corps to respond to tips from the Information

Services supervisor and to initiate contacts for information. Any news releases sent to newspapers are also sent to radio and television stations.

INFORMATION SEARCH SERVICES

Another source of information available to staff, and to some degree to school people, is provided through the state subscription to BOCS. Involvement in BOCS is primarily for staff use. If a school requests information which a computerized search might provide, the service is made available; however, it is not advertised. Coordinated through the assistant to the Superintendent, the information service has had limited use even within the SEA. "A major weakness in use of information packets such as those from BOCS," the coordinator reported, "is that there is no information consultant or information linker" at the SEA to "negotiate the question" with the user and to specify to BOCS the exact nature of the request. Consequently, the staff has not found the materials they are receiving as helpful as they might be. "Computer impersonalization" has resulted in large amounts of relatively useless data being received. With information from research and other studies seen as vital to step three in the School-Community Assistance Process, the step involving the search for alternatives, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction is hopeful that support can be found to provide for an "information linker."

INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

Information Services, responsible for the public information program, also handles internal communication. An internal newsletter is published every second week, with a compilation of educational news clippings from papers across the state distributed to staff in the alternate weeks.

NEED FOR CENTRALIZED LIBRARY AND INFORMATION FUNCTION

A great deal of emphasis is also being placed upon involvement of professional staff at all levels in identification of major areas of concern and in such matters as recommendations for staff reorganization. One direct result of this Office wide endeavor has been the identification of the need for a centralized library and information function. A volunteer committee was established to develop a proposal and, following a month's in depth study, a plan was submitted to the management group for consideration in August, 1973.

To the committee, the need for a centralized library and information function was obvious. With no staff librarian and with a professional library consisting primarily of free curriculum bulletins and materials, the committee felt that there were "information-flow problems." "Cognizant of financial constraints and yet eager to see even the slightest movement toward implementation of some if its ideas, the committee attempted to provide decision-making options," according to a report prepared by the study group.

A six-step plan, with a budget for each step, was presented, which called for

1. A central information and referral desk.
2. A periodical and pamphlet library.
3. A professional library.
4. Retrievel and reference services.
5. Media services.
6. Reporting and research services.

OSPI management responded to the proposal by authorizing recruitment of staff to handle the first four steps in the committee's plan. By December 1973

these steps had been implemented.

SUMMARY

In summary, Montana recognizes dissemination as a vital element of a change strategy, and, at the same time, considers two key state strategies as dissemination efforts in the broadest sense. Specific information dissemination activities are dispersed throughout the Office, with responsibility for coordination assigned to the assistant to the Superintendent and some achieved informally through the decision making group - the management team - which meets monthly. Although no specific funds are earmarked for dissemination, other than those in budgets for the production of printed materials, use has been made of Title V, ESEA, support to strengthen the information base of the Office through a subscription to a computerized information service and to improve staff skills and competencies for working with schools through the School-Community Assistance Process.

Two major threads run through Montana's dissemination efforts - getting services closer to the people and helping schools learn "how to" plan, not telling them "what to" implement.

NEW YORK

Like a number of other states, New York has both densely and sparsely populated areas. At the southeastern tip is the nation's largest city with its 7.8 million people. To the north are extensive agricultural and forest lands. In the fall of 1972 New York City had 1.1 million pupils in its public schools; 40 districts at the other end of the population continuum had a combined enrollment of only 3,487 pupils. In all, the state had approximately 3.5 million pupils enrolled in public schools and approximately .7 million in private schools. A survey of ethnic and racial distribution of students and staff in public schools in 1972-73 showed that 25.5 percent of all pupils were classified in the two minority groups - black and Spanish-surnamed Americans. This was a slight increase over 1971-72 when 15.8 percent of the pupils in New York State's public schools were classified as "black" and 9.4 percent as "Spanish-surnamed Americans." Pupils in these two minority groups, according to the 1972-73 report, accounted for 58.9 percent of the enrollment in the Big Six cities: New York City (62.4 percent minority); Buffalo (43.9 percent); Rochester (43.5 percent), Albany (36.9 percent); Syracuse (28 percent); and Yonkers (21.8 percent). The study also showed that for the state as a whole 5.8 percent of the 213,718 professional personnel in the public schools were either black or Spanish-surnamed Americans. Although the total number of pupils declined slightly from 1971 to 1972, the number of operating school districts increased from 737 to 740.

In addition to its public school districts, the state also has some 47 Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). Created by state law, BOCES are service organizations of long standing, which "do for a district that which it cannot do by itself or for itself because of size, financial burden, etc." What was

described as "the favorable BOCES state aid formula" encourages districts to seek services through the cooperative, although participation is not mandated. Locally selected, the "district superintendent" who heads up a BOCES is partly a "state employee, for some of his salary is from the state," and his appointment is subject to confirmation by the Commissioner of Education. In addition, he can only "be removed with the approval of the Commissioner." BOCES are flexible; they can initiate programs in response to needs, although they cannot undertake any activity without approval of the state education agency. However, the state has "encouraged them to be innovative." As one staff member said, "The State Education Department is relying increasingly on BOCES as central change agents."

Total current expenditures for public school education in New York State in 1972-73 were estimated to be approximately $6 billion dollars, of which 52 percent was from local sources; 41 percent from state sources; and 7 percent from federal sources.

Since 1904, "all educational institutions - public and private, elementary and secondary, colleges and universities, libraries, and museums - have been included in one chartered institution: The University of the State of New York." General supervision of educational activities was placed under "a single control board." According to a state education agency publication, "the Board of Regents is the oldest continuing, most powerful, board of education in the United States." Regents are elected by a vote of the joint houses of the state Legislature, with one being elected each year "except as vacancies for a reason other than termination of the term of office occur." The 15 members serve 15 year overlapping terms, with retirement mandatory at 70 years of age.

The Commissioner of Education, who is also president of the university, is appointed by the Regents and serves at their pleasure. Chief executive officer

of the Regents, he is also the chief administrative officer of the 3,000 member State Education Department (SED).

With responsibilities encompassing elementary, secondary, adult continuing, and higher education; vocational rehabilitation; state museum and science services; state libraries; and the office of state history, the department is faced with difficulties in coordination. Two structures have been established to provide for face to face exchange of ideas and information: department wide coordination is the concern of the Commissioner's Cabinet, which is composed of the Executive Deputy Commissioner, the assistants to the Commissioner, such staff as the head of the Division of Public Information, and deputy and associate commissioners. The group meets weekly. An Executive Council, composed of assistant commissioners, focuses on coordination of programs and activities of Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education. This group too meets weekly. The structure of the Department has undergone some modification in recent years in an effort to strengthen articulation between programs and to improve services to schools; further modification is anticipated. Establishment of a "large SED staff in New York City" was one recent change.

Traditionally, as an SED bulletin reports, "The Department has been perceived as the definer of goals...the enforcer of regulations and laws on education." As a result, relationships with schools have been "very regulatory". According to staff members, the Regents examinations have set much of this tone. The examinations are "prepared at the state, given at the end of selected courses, and scored at the state." Although the department has had no power to enforce a common curriculum, "Regents exams" have tended to influence content. However, recent years have seen changes. The state's supervisory function has evolved into "a supportive, catalytic role" as local districts have been "encouraged to

assume greater responsibility for shaping their own educational destinies." The department has become increasingly responsive to local needs, according to staff members, as it has "seen itself more and more as a service agency." As the Commissioner points out in a recent bulletin, "the Department stands ready to waive...requirements when presented with responsible proposals for new departures in educational programs."

CHANGE STRATEGIES: PRIORITIES

Designed to encourage these "new departures" were a number of change and dissemination activities. Priorities were identified by the Commissioner: "the whole arena of education for the disadvantaged"; the education of children in big cities; racial integration of schools and "not just those in big cities"; improvement in basic skills, "with reading number one." Emphasis was being placed upon development of alternative learning environments, strengthening of regional activities, development of new and better ways of delivering services to schools.

PROJECT REDESIGN

A major change strategy, Project Redesign has been "one of the top priority progams of the State Education Department for the past three years." Based upon the department's growing conviction that "long lasting change is not brought about through scattered individual projects" or "add-ons to the traditional structure," Redesign is

> a comprehensive, systematic process of change involving the participation of a total community in the examination and redefinition of its educational needs and goals. As a change strategy, Redesign deals with the entire system of education and not only is concerned with setting goals and designing programs to facilitate those goals, but is also basically concerned with developing an implementation strategy for putting programs into operation

The effort has been funded under Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The project has involved four "prototype districts," a multi-school group through one BOCES, and 49 schools in a secondary network. Representative of the rest of the state, the four prototypes include a rural district in the far western part of the state with an average daily attendance (ADA) of 1,800; a small city district with 7,000 ADA; a suburban district of some 13,000 ADA; and a district within New York City with 30,000 pupils in grades kindergarten through nine. Each school had 1) "good relationships between the board and superintendent, 2) a desire to change, and 3) "no community crisis." In addition to the Redesign staff at the department, some 13 regional coordinators became a part of the project and SED personnel with other responsibilities were named as coordinators to work with Redesign schools. During the first year's operation each coordinator was expected to spend a major portion of time in the district, with decreasing amounts of time in the next two years. The first job of the coordinator, according to one of them, was to establish a relationship with the administrator and "to get a picture of the district." Subsequent tasks involved assisting groups to work out the "structure for the community council"; helping them to identify resources in response to their needs; "trying to help people in the department understand a different way of working, being resource people, not enforcers of mandates." In short, according to a coordinator, "We did a little bit of everything...you meet their needs, listen to their problems, serve at their level." Another staff member saw the coordinators as "planning, management, resource people."

Each prototype received about $100,000 each year. These funds provided for the school Redesign coordinator plus any additional personnel needed; consultants to work with staff and community; training workshops, again some involving both staff and community; substitutes to allow teachers to visit exemplary programs in other sites; and other expenses. Each district was to involve community, staff, students, in the identification of needs and goals and in the development

of long range and specific work plans. How is it all working out? The department has learned a number of things and a number of changes have been implemented in the prototypes. The SED "has discovered that the change process takes time; ...to get the total community involved...to take first steps in effecting program changes." Requiring schools to work in different ways has meant that "the department had to respond in different ways." As prototype districts identified needs, "priority areas which would require a concerted effort," a series of six task force groups, each with membership from across divisional lines at the department was set up to respond: Assessment, Communications, Evaluation, Management Services, Program (not fully implemented during the first two years), and Training and Education. Each of these groups has provided services, in many cases new and different services to the prototypes. A second important learning has also taken place: planning must include both long range and immediate goals. As one department position paper states: "we also found out that it is necessary to generate initial success through small, achievable steps rather than by remaking any major segment of the system in one giant step." Prototypes have achieved such change as development of "a pilot alternative high school program," "a pilot program in preschool education and the introduction of substantially more flexibility in the secondary program", "a continued development of the new programs and activities aimed at a more open high school." At the regional level mechanisms are being developed to expand educational reform. Regional Redesign coordinators "are working with their 49 school systems, many of which have in operation both short and long-range plans." As one staff member summed it up, the department "is learning how the state can assist local districts in changing."

A second massive change effort is also funded in part by Title III, ESEA, and in part by state funds. Improving Cost Effectiveness in Instruction through

Technology (ICEIT) is a cooperative project of the SED and one of the BOCES. The project, which has involved development of a series of television programs, is designed for such purposes as improving "the relevance of the elementary curriculum," "guaranteeing equal educational opportunity to all children in the state," "allowing the professional teacher to concentrate on basic skills development," and "introducing quality control into the instructional process." Tested in four schools with 296 fourth grade students, programs will be piloted in a limited number of schools. In these schools, one half of the fourth graders will spend the morning with teachers in basic skills development while the other half are receiving instruction via television with teacher aides as monitors. In the afternoon the two groups "will swap places." As one staff member reported, efforts to explore ways to improve instruction and at the same time cut costs are increasingly important as education becomes more and more expensive. Full utilization of technology may be one answer, staff believe.

TOWARD MORE REGIONALIZATION

Each of the two projects identified by staff as major change strategies - Redesign and ICEIT - were being developed and implemented in cooperation with the BOCES structure. Further efforts toward regionalization of services are currently under way by the state education agency. Groups of BOCES are being joined together to form consortia, or regional compacts. Presently in operation are 12 such regional groups, plus one in New York City. A BOCES superintendent selected by the SED and the cooperating BOCES superintendents heads up the regional orgnization. Regional management teams composed of the BOCES superintendents, a large city superintendent, other superintendents on the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, and the diocesan superintendent manage the multi-BOCES services such as data processing, information services, and drug education. The regional Redesign coordinator also reported to this management

team. At the same time that these "super regions" are being developed, the State Education Department is encouraging implementation of such services as special education and vocational education through the BOCES structure.

INFORMATION SERVICES

A long time commitment to dissemination is evident in a number of activies. The department has participated in the National Dissemination Project, with the coordinator of the Educational Programs and Studies Information Service (EPSIS) having served on the steering committee.

Based upon the philosophy that "your decisions are only as good as your information", the department has utilized both state and federal funds in developing EPSIS. Services are available to department and BOCES staffs and educators in local schools and institutions of higher education in New York State. Located near the education section of the State Library, EPSIS has access to some 600 journals and newsletters, a full collection of professional books and reference tools, and an extensive library of curriculum guides and textbooks. In addition, EPSIS has a complete ERIC collection. Basically, EPSIS provides three kinds of services: 1) the ERIC service supplies, free, up to 20 abstract or microfiche copies of ERIC documents identified by the requester; 2) on a more limited basis, in depth searches of ERIC files, Current Index to Educational Journals (CIJE), and other resources available to EPSIS are also offered; 3) selected dissemination of information (SDI) targets information for specific audiences.

Computer searches of ERIC and CIJE were formerly handled under contract to a center in North Dakota. The majority of the nearly 400 searches done in one five and a half month period were for State Education Department staff. The State Unviersity of New York "Biomedical System" is currently utilized to provide computer search services statewide, although there are volume limitations.

This service is made available through the state's regional offices and the Redesign prototype districts, each of which has a trained information consultant. Expansion of the computer retrieval program is expected to reach additional BOCES within a year or two. A number of the regional Redesign coordinators are volunteer information consultants, with special training. Although participation varies, in general these consultants have held awareness sessions about EPSIS in regional schools and provide some additional services. Packets sent out by EPSIS may be returned to the requester by the information consultant, but "there is no personal contact guaranteed."

Newsletters published by the Research Coordinating Unit, the special unit on drug education, the Division of Continuing Adult Education, and the Division of Higher Education, regularly include a bibliography of pertinent ERIC documents cited in current issues of Research in Education. Information about how to obtain either hard copy or microfiche is also given. These bibliographies are prepared by consultants in the four units who have been trained by EPSIS staff. In May and June of 1973 nearly 300 requests for ERIC information were generated through the newsletter SDI service - evidence of its effectiveness. The total number of requests for abstracts or microfiche for the 14 months from May 1972 to June 1973 was slightly under 2500, 70 percent from local school teachers and administrators.

Another SDI service is being piloted through one BOCES. Approximately 25 to 30 topics of current concern were listed by the information consultant and each participating school was asked to rank them according to local needs and interests. From the top 17 identified, each client could select five for which he would receive information packets. In general, these packets contained both bibliographies of pertinent ERIC, CIJE, book, and non-print materials and reprints of appropriate articles. An overview of the issue was included with the first

monthly packet. In January of 1974, in cooperation with a BOCES, EPSIS will utilize this model and expand the service to all BOCES.

Through its involvement in the Redesign project, one BOCES has developed a model communications network to facilitate an information support program. It is this model which EPSIS would like to promote in all regions. However, two major constraints are seen: lack of time for BOCES staff to perform the necessary coordination and lack of commitment on the part of local districts to release staff to carry out their functions. The pilot BOCES has established a Research Committee consisting of several chief information consultants, who are responsible for developing awareness of EPSIS service, screening requests, negotiating requests, and disseminating searches.

Each consultant is assigned a group of school districts with which he works. An intermediary information consultant in each participating district keeps abreast of district information needs, disseminates information within his schools, performs the initial screening of research requests, and acts as the district contact for the BOCES Research Committee. Schools have provided a minimum amount of time, a half day every second week, for performance of information responsibilities. Currently, the model is funded under the Redesign project. However, there is a feeling that if Redesign money were withdrawn schools would be willing to provide the needed support as they have found the information service "so valuable." EPSIS staff also believe that as emphasis continues to be placed upon local planning, this communication model will become even more important. "It provides for two-way linkages - planning information will be transmitted upward; relevant packaged information can be transmitted back through the network." An immediate benefit from the model, according to the EPSIS coordinator, is that it provides a mechanism for identifying exemplary programs which should be in a databank of effective programs - those locally developed

as well as those funded under state and federal sources.

EPSIS has also produced special bibliographies on priority topics for use by department staff. Last year nine on such subjects as reading mathematics, the gifted student, bilingual education, and school/community relations were compiled. A number of special information packages were produced for specific audiences: Redesign Information Package, a school finance package, an urban education package, and most recently, an energy crisis package. EPSIS also provides information to organizations such as the Science Supervisors Association about materials available which are pertinent to their interests.

Evaluation of EPSIS to date has been primarily quantitative. However, as the coordinator noted, "The ultimate evaluation of an information system is measured by the amount of real impact the information has on the user." To that end, a plan is being developed to ascertain "to what specific use retrieved information was put and whether or not any identifiable result of that utility is in evidence."

Plans for the future development of EPSIS include completion of a databank of educational program information using a form developed by representatives of a number of SED units. This information would be catalogued under appropriate ERIC descriptors. It was proposed that the collecting of this information be piloted through BOCES and be limited to BOCES program information and perhaps bilingual education program information.

A number of other information collecting and disseminating programs are also operated by the department. Among these are System for Pupil and Program Evaluation and Development (SPPED). The purpose of this program is "to improve educational decision making and instructional management by focusing attention on the intended outcomes of instruction, by fostering evaluation procedures that relate measurement and objectives, and by applying computer technology to

quicken and simplify planning, management, and evaluation tasks." A bank of reading objectives developed by Educational Systems Division of Random House working in conjunction with SED staff has been programmed for the computer. Both objectives and a manual for using the system are being piloted in a limited number of schools.

Another information system, Evaluation Service Center for Occupational Education (ESCOE) contains objectives developed by teachers. Discussion of coordination of department information and dissemination services has been initiated and a committee has been formed. In addition, the department is exploring the possibility of developing a Resource and Demonstration Center which would bring together some of the various information, materials centers, and training facilities currently in existence across the agency. Such a center might include inservice, a "live demonstration classroom," and information and materials resources. By 1975, one staff member reported, there will be space vacant in the Education Building which might house such a center. Development of a Resource and Demonstration Center would probably be over a period of time, with various components gradually phased in.

PRINTED MATERIALS

A $1.8 million budget for printing attests to the importance which the New York State Education Department places upon printed materials. All such materials are processed through the Bureau of Publications whether printed in house or commercially. Included among the materials produced each year are curriculum guides, position papers, statistical reports, project reports, Regents and professional examinations, and such items as maps for the State Museum and Science Services.

Because of the volume of printing, priorities have been set: Regents Examinations, professional examinations, Inside Education (the department's magazine), and curriculum materials.

Approximately 180 curriculum-related publications are printed annually. These are developed in a number of ways. Usually, however, two bureaus share responsibility: the subject discipline bureau and either the elementary or secondary curriculum development bureau. The need for a course guide may be established by a review of the literature, by requests from the field, or by observation of current practices in schools by department staff members. Both the subject area bureau and the curriculum development bureau must concur in the need for a particular publication. The bulletin may be written by teachers employed to develop the guide during the summer months or may be staff written. Advisory groups of teachers and others most probably will review the guide. In many instances courses of study will be field tested for a year before they are prepared for publication by the curriculum development bureau. One staff member delineated the responsibilities of the two bureaus concerned: "The charge of the curriculum development bureau is to develop useful materials to help teachers in the classroom; the charge of the subject area bureau is to be of assistance to schools in implementing the materials." Although a number of curriculum materials are developed each year, there is "no mandate that schools must use them." However, the demand for copies was reported as evidence of their effectiveness. Once published, bulletins are sent to superintendents and building administrators with a cover letter suggesting "the groups which should be using the material." A form for requesting the number of copies needed is included. There was a feeling that state curriculum guides provide schools a "necessary framework."

However, as the Commissioner noted in a current position paper, "Most recent State courses of study---have been so developed that they require local 'adaptation' within a flexible framework and do not lend themselves to 'adoption'.

Inside Education, the department's magazine published ten times each year, is the responsibility of the Division of Public Information. Perceived as a major dissemination vehicle, the magazine has a circulation of approximately 28,000. In addition to superintendents and other administrators, Inside Education is sent to each local teachers association, the presidents of local boards, and community leaders such as mayors and parent-teacher organization presidents. Copies are also distributed to the mass media across the state. Before the beginning of each school year, a broad outline for the ten issues is set up, with emphasis upon departmental priorities. An Editorial Advisory Board, composed of such people as the executive deputy commissioner, the deputy commissioner for legal affairs, and an assistant commissioner for planning, reacts to this outline and reads copy before publication for consistency with SED policy, etc. Each issue usually contains an article on some topic of current concern, such as alternative learning environments, and descriptions of innovative programs in New York State schools. According to the staff, comments from the field indicate a favorable response to the magazine, with an increase in the number of articles submitted. Further evidence of quality can be seen in the awards which the magazine has received from national associations.

Approximately 30 newsletters, each targeted for a specific audience, are published each month by the department. Written by various units and divisions, the newsletters are edited "for grammar, not editorial content" by the publications office.

Position papers are also an important component of printed dissemination. Nineteen such papers were issued in the last year and a half. Approximately 9,000 copies of each are distributed to educators, community leaders, and others. "Providing Optional Learning Environments in New York State Schools", dated October 1973, was designed, according to the Commissioner's preface, "to stimulate and encourage other school systems to experiment with and diversify their learning environment to the end that we can anticipate a zero-reject system." Guidelines for schools wishing to institute major optional programs are included in the publication. These were developed "in order to encourage further responsible experimentation and the introduction of alternatives in more school systems." As the publication notes, "The procedure is fully intended to be supportive rather than restrictive."

OTHER DISSEMINATION/CHANGE STRATEGIES

Some attention is given to disseminating ideas through involvement of classroom teachers and administrators in conferences, some sponsored by the department, some by schools, others by professional associations. The "strong relationship which exists between staff and the associations" has resulted in much departmental participation in these meetings. This year emphasis is being placed upon use of exhibits of exemplary Title III, ESEA projects at three conferences: one involving building administrators; one, members of local boards; and one, the Parent-Teacher Association. A consultant from the department will be available to answer questions. Projects featured, in addition to one of the "validated projects", were selected on the basis of first year evaluation which "shows the project deserves to be displayed." These exhibits will provide a vehicle for securing input about a second major dissemination strategy being seriously considered - "packaging." If "field interest warrants and money is available," "packages" to move ideas

from one school to another will be developed. These "packages" will include an on site visit to a project which has agreed to become a demonstration site, informational materials, and "certain kinds of assistance" from the SED Title III staff. "Consumer demand is being considered in setting up 'packages'", a staff member reported. "We are letting potential visitors select the projects, by indicating their interest in certain ones." However, despite popular demand, the staff would probably "package only those that were economically feasible or might package segments of a larger project." The scope of the endeavor depends upon the extent of Title III funds available for the demonstration sites and the visiting schools.

Workshops too bring teachers together where new techniques can be learned, change promoted. Staff reported that "occasionally these are originated by the department; however, many are sponsored by outside groups." With inservice a "point of negotiation between teachers and boards," there is no state inservice requirement. However, departmental activities such as Redesign have resulted in inservice requests. For example, one Redesign coordinator reported that it has been "the teachers union" in a Redesign school which has asked for "an IDI training session" to be set up.

With local school planning seen as a major vehicle for encouraging productive change, efforts are also underway to gain agreement on the components of good planning and to identify and describe examples of the components in school districts. These will be "made known through the BOCES." Since last year SED, BOCES, and local school staffs have been working to gather the information. However, the project is not complete as yet. Another catalogue under development will include current alternative programs and schools which are successfully operating.

An important development which must be considered as a strategy for change and dissemination is the department wide effort to improve coordination. A number of projects speak to this point. The use of interdisciplinary, across the department task forces to work with schools, as in Project Redesign and the Basic Skills Task Force, "strengthen communication within the SED" and result in "better service to schools." Attention is also being given to coordinating programs, such as reading, which may be funded and administered through a number of different offices. The Title III staff is concerned with disseminating information about Title III projects to other departmental divisions through the involvement of personnel in various areas in monitoring, reviewing, visiting, and providing assistance. Each bureau chief has designated an official liaison to work on Title III concerns.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

News releases are a key element in the public information program. Distributed to the mass media, all school superintendents, to some 1200 teacher associations, and "bureau chiefs and above" in the department, they are a major source of information about Board of Regent actions and important department programs. There is a feeling that use of both television and radio need to be built up. A "radio hotline" was being planned in the fall of 1973. Featuring three to five minute taped reports hooked up to a telephone answering device, the service would make it possible for radio stations to have ready access to department news. With a small public information staff - three professionals - and the scope of the department, being fully aware of all that "is going on" was reported as a problem.

SUMMARY

Strategies designed to bring about fundamental changes in the educational system are under way in New York State. These have influenced internal operations of the State Education Department as well as ways of working with districts. Evidence of this can be seen, for example, in the task force approach to planning for and delivering services, the increasing regionalization of services, and the utilization of technology to strengthen education. And supportive of all change efforts are a number of dissemination activities flowing information to decision makers.

NORTH CAROLINA

Twelfth in the nation in total population, North Carolina ranks eleventh in numbers of pupils. Fifty-five precent of the state's population is rural, almost twice the rural percentage of the nation as a whole. The "Mountains" region in the west has approximately one sixth of North Carolina's population. In the east, the Coastal Plains have approximately one third, and the central Piedmont, approximately one half. Although 22 percent of the population as a whole is classified as "non-white", 28 percent of the pupil popluation is classified as "black"; 2 percent as "Indian"; and 70 percent as "white".

In 1972-73 the state's 1,158,549 pupils attended school in 100 county and 52 city administrative units, having 91,845 professional and non-professional personnel. Current expenditures for public schools in 1971-72 were $778,618,231. Unlike many states, North Carolina supplies more than one half of the support for public schools, with 66.8 percent from state sources, 18 percent from local funds, and 15.2 percent from federal funds.

Policy for public school education in North Carolina is set by a 13 member State Board of Education. Eleven members are appointed by the Governor; two, the Lieutenant Governor and State Treasurer, are ex officio. Technical institutions and community colleges are also under this Board. Members serve eight year over-lapping terms. As one state education agency staff member noted, "The law spells out the duties and responsibilities with great power to the Board." For example, superintendents of local administrative units, elected by local boards, are subject to approval by the State Superintendent of Public

Instruction and the State Board of Education. An elected official, the state superintendent is secretary to and chief administrative officer of the Board. Under the direction of the superintendent is a State Department of Public Instruction (DPI) composed of some 475 personnel. The department is organized in accordance with broad functional areas: Administrative Services, Human Relations and Student Affairs, Personnel Relations and Public Affairs, Research and Development, Program Services, Special Services, and Federal-State Relations. Each functional area is headed by an assistant superintendent.

The executive staff of the department is composed of these assistant superintendents plus the Controller of the State Board of Education, the administrative assistant to the superintendent, the special assistant for public information, the deputy assistant for program services, and the deputy assistant for human relations.

To "get service closer to the people and to improve communication," the department has established three regional service centers. These centers are the first phase toward the long-range goal of a regional office in each of the state's eight educational districts. Service centers coordinate and direct field services of the total state agency and provide liaison among the department, local school units, and "other groups involved in the process of education." With staffs varying in size in accordance with the population of the region and the services performed, these "extension agencies" have no "bureaucratic or administrative functions."

Since the late sixties, North Carolina has considered "dissemination as a means for improving education throughout the state." In keeping with that philosophy, the department has been involved in a number of projects and activities, including development of an extensive Research and Information Center. At the same time,

a three-pronged "state strategy for change" has been evolving: 1) development of leadership ability of local administrative units to do "good planning"; 2) implementation of "research, development, and assessment in such a way that decision makers have information with which to make change"; and 3) regionalization of state services to local administrative units.

RESEARCH AND INFORMATION CENTER

An outgrowth of a project originally funded by the National Center for Educational Communication, a very large research and information center is maintained. The earlier project pilot tested with four administrative units the idea of flowing information from research, primarily the ERIC system, to central office key personnel in response to their requests. An information consultant was trained for each of the four pilot schools to translate "the problems of the central staff," for the "retrieval person" at the department. Responses were in the format desired by the local unit: research documents or syntheses of research. The department viewed the effort as "trying to lead people toward a problem solving orientation." Evaluation, based on the kinds of projects for which the districts requested information, the number of people who knew about the information that had been received, and the number of requests generated locally, indicated that the project should be maintained. Specifically, a recommendation was made that the state put $75,000 in the project to support one person in each region and provide 10 searches per month for schools participating. Although this project was not funded, the present information unit did develop.

The purpose of the center is to maintain and disseminate "a comprehensive store of research and other educational information to department and other school personnel in the state." Special emphasis is given to "providing information

to personnel who are in the process of planning new programs; collecting and disseminating information about experimental programs." Some attention is given to "assisting personnel at the local level in establishing and using information centers," although staff limitations preclude major efforts in this direction.

Supported 75 percent from state funds and 25 percent from Title V, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the center includes a complete ERIC collection, almost 7,000 professional books, a vertical file of such materials as bulletins from other state education agencies, approximately 250 educational journals, numerous newsletters, and reference books. The center can provide both computer and manual searches. However, there is a $20 to $25 charge for computer searches; no charge for manual searches. Approximately 12 searches a month are done for department personnel, with some additional ones for local school people. Although the majority are for department staff, there is a strong conviction that the center should not be "just an in-house resource." With a four-member professional staff, the center currently has a "limited outreach." There is no full-time person to "send out," although staff members do attend educational conferences to explain the service and, when possible, will respond to requests from local education agencies for someone to come to a school. A slide tape presentation on the center and ERIC is sent out upon request. For local units, the center will reproduce journal articles for which there may be charge for paper over 15 pages; will send up to 20 microfiche at no charge; will develop a bibliography; and will include the name of a person who may supply additional information.

In addition to searches in response to requests, the center retrieval specialists also develop syntheses and annotated bibliographies on departmental priorities

or other topics of concern. Currently, syntheses of information about kindergarten and assessment are being prepared. Like other information packets, these will be distributed within the department and by request to the field. Among other packets available are one on accountability, one on year-round school, and one on student unrest. Original distribution of these was dependent upon the nature of the work. For example, the information on accountability was distributed to department staff and all superintendents within the state; national distribution was through the consortium of states concerned with accountability. Because staff view dissemination as "a controlled process of multi-media communications through which information is passed to and gathered from target audiences in order to establish levels of awareness and to induce reactions and/or adoption of defined programs," information "packages' on occasion have included audio-visual material. For example, a package on individualized instruction was made up of a position paper expressing the department's concern for and point of view toward individualization, a film depicting programs, and a teacher's "how to" manual. Staff in the center work on these special assignments, such as preparing the script for a slide tape presentation on the year-round school. Currently staff is cooperating in preparation of a television program on a state-funded experimental program. Developing special exhibits, such as the one on career education, is also an information center responsibility in keeping with the view that dissemination is more than the printed word.

To develop awareness of and interest in services, the center publishes two newsletters, both on a monthly basis. Although these are primarily directed toward members of the department, they are sent to superintendents upon request. They are also included with responses to searches. ERIC Instant Research is usually an annotated bibliography of ERIC documents in areas of current concern such as career and environmental education and individualized instruction. A

recent issue carried a note that the DPI "will send you any of the microfiche listed...at no charge." Research and Information Center Emphasis, also an annotated bibliography, features selected journal articles, government reports, and professional books. The center also keeps staff up to date with a monthly listing of recent acquisitions.

The Reading Resources Room is a new component of the Information Center. Here all books and information files on reading are housed. A staff member is assigned to the room.

No formal evaluation of the impact of center services has been conducted; however, an informal tally of requests is maintained.

Prior to the NCEC project, the center was basically a library. In the last few years it has been moving toward a comprehensive information program, reaching beyond "the walls of a library." Emphasis has been upon "disseminating" its services, rather than "upon waiting for people to come in and use the facility." The future mission of the center is viewed as "much more action-change-oriented." A long-range plan has been developed which calls for use of field representatives if funds can be secured. The major need in becoming a "true diffusion center" is for personnel to assist local school staffs, first to identify their problem areas ("theirs, not ours"), and then to use the information and material prepared in response to the need.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT: BASIC TO CHANGE

Research, development and assessment efforts form the backbone of the program to flow information to school administrative units. A statewide system of approved experimentation and innovation is designed to produce the information that can lead to change. Included among the programs are the State Experimentation

in Educational Development (SEED) projects; Title II, ESEA projects; Occupational Research Unit projects; and kindergarten evaluation activities.

A number of assumptions are basic to development of the system: 1) "The problem with research and development is to get people to use what is known. Decisions are often not based on hard data. There is a need to educate people in the use of information to separate fact from opinion." 2) "There are some wonderful things going on that ought to be replicated." Information about programs that work "ought to go to decision makers. It should be taken into consideration in budgeting." As a result of these beliefs, funds have been designed to support two of the retrieval specialists in the information center, and other activities, such as development of demonstration centers, are under way.

What North Carolina identifies as the "Sanford Project" illustrates the model for change which the department believes is "most viable." It was summarized by one staff member as "built upon the ripple effect, with inservice the vital ingredient in spreading the ideas." Federal funds for vocational education, research and experimentation were used to support a project to develop individualized instruction materials in two vocational areas. Two years in development, the materials were shown to be effective if used correctly. By 1972-73 the department felt they were ready to be disseminated to other schools. Awareness of the materials was developed through 12 regional meetings during the school year. At these "show and tell" conferences, superintendents and others had an opportunity to see students using the materials. Then in the summer of 1973, 176 teachers from 16 schools and three additional programs came to Sanford for one week intensive workshops. In teams of five to eight people, including both vocational and academic teachers, they learned how to use the materials. In the fall of 1973, these teams are implementing the ideas in their own programs.

At the end of approximately six months "in a developmental phase," the 19 schools will "become demonstration sites." Charged with expanding use of the materials, each of these schools will bring in teacher teams from three additional schools. By the end of the school year, ideas developed at the Sanford site should have been diffused to 57 other sites through this "each one teach some" method. As one staff member noted, the department "can see the fruits of research being infused into the system across the state." There is a feeling that this model "may be used with any research effort." At the same time that these materials are being disseminated, they will also be field tested in six sites in a variety of situations. Although they have been shown to be effective under certain conditions, the department will now have an opportunity to see how well they work in a different setting. Because of the Occupational Research Unit funding, Sanford was described as the"Cadillac version"; field testing in situations with no special financial support will determine how well they work in "a Ford version." Modifications may be made as a result of this effort.

Title III, ESEA, is also using a variation of the demonstration site-inservice training model. One of the state's "validated projects" has been funded for the 1973-74 school year to provide each week a half-day observation period for visitors. This is the first in what is envisioned as a series of such sites "to get people to consider a program" by seeing it in action. A teacher training day will be provided as follow up, if interest warrants. In addition, the department will provide consultant help to implement the program in a new school. Success of the project will be determined by how many administrative units actually adopt or adapt ideas based on the validated project.

Closely related to the Title III effort, is the state SEED program which provides small grants for "finding new and better ways to solve habitual problems." Grants are for two years. Begun in 1971 when the North Carolina General Assembly

appropriated money to be used for research and development, the program is competitive, with schools submitting project applications to the department. Nineteen grants were made throughout the state in the first year of operation.

While the major diffusion effort is concentrated on demonstration-inservice, other activities, such as publication program conferences, and evaluation visits, are also directed toward informing educators about research and development projects.

Kindergarten evaluation was described by one staff member as "one of the biggest diffusion areas this year." In 1969, the North Carolina legislature appropriated $1 million to establish the first state supported kindergartens. Still in the pilot stage, the program is to become universal in 1978. During these formative years, the department has taken a number of steps to ensure that effective kindergarten programs are developed. Charged with evaluating the pilot programs, the department is also committed to getting information from these studies to those developing new programs. Consequently, evaluative information is "packaged so that it is useful for practitioners." In addition, a full-time information retrieval specialist has been assigned to the research and information center to search the literature for the "best kindergarten practices." Such information is synthesized for use by those planning programs. Drawing upon research from across the nation, staff people are preparing training and inservice packages. If the eight DPI staff who serve as regional coordinators of early childhood development identify problems in the field which require research and development, the department will first attempt to locate pertinent information which deals with similar areas. However, if appropriate material cannot be found, a research program will be set up, if the problem is of a "practical nature."

PLANNING: KEY TO IMPROVING SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

Like a number of other states, North Carolina has seen comprehensive planning as a basic tool to improving management of public schools. Three years ago, the department established a new division to provide technical assistance in planning both within the state agency and to local units. A ten-member staff was set up. These consultants had varied professional experience: some had been educators; others were from business and industry; still others were from the military. This "deliberate mixing of backgrounds" was seen as a strength. Each consultant spent from six to ten weeks in training in New York for his new role as a "facilitator of planning."

Eight of these professionals are assigned to the field where each works with eight to ten units to assist the superintendent and his leadership team in making plans -- program, facilities, and fiscal plans. Currently, 100 units are receiving this assistance. These consultants do not suggest what decisions should be made; they facilitate the making of decisions. As they work in the field and identify a need for a specific skill, such as needs assessment, they call upon DPI expertise to assist them and the local school staffs.

In trying to shift to the local unit the responsibility for program decisions, the State Board of Education in 1972 adopted a policy which, in effect, says that hereafter schools are accredited on the basis of their own long-range plans and evidence of implementation and evaluation. As a result of this emphasis upon comprehensive planning, accreditation is no longer granted to a single building within a local unit but is concerned with total operation.

REGIONALIZATION

North Carolina's system of regional centers grew from a recommendation of a

statewide committee established by the Governor in 1969 to study education. Because the state has three distinct geographical regions, each with very diverse needs, it was felt that regional centers, close to schools, would strengthen educational services. In addition, the "heavy state funding" made it imperative that schools be in close communication with the DPI; however, distances, especially from east to west, were "very great" and communication was not always easy. The first financial support for the venture was from the Appalachian Regional Commission, which provided a planning grant to explore the feasibility of educational centers. On the basis of this report, two were established -- one in the far west, the other in the north west, both to serve small, rural mountainous counties. A third was later established in the eastern Coastal Plains region. Although the goal is eventually to have eight centers, there "will probably never be one in the Raleigh area, where the DPI is."

North Carolina's centers are "not patterned after those in operation in other states." The network "will be an extension of the Department of Public Instruction, but will not be intermediate units with regional authority." Regional centers are thought of as "arms of the state agency," which get services to "consumers and improve the two-way flow of communication." However, local administrative units, can, if they so desire, bypass the center and still deal directly with the department.

Assigned to the regional centers are such services as those concerned with special education, occupational education, school food programs, and, in varying degrees, media. Each center has an instructional materials center for special education. Other media available may be different from center to center. Services offered also vary with the needs of the region. Schools served by a center may elect to fund some services which can best be handled cooperatively. Each center has a director, who serves as "kind of a deputy to the state

superintendent, as a facilitator, and a coordinator of services." No program decisions are made at the center level.

Basically the centers are state supported. However, there are some federal funds in program areas, and, in the eastern center, the migrant education program is federally supported.

A recommendation to expand the present three centers to five or six is to be placed before the next legislature.

PRINTED MATERIALS

Special efforts have been directed toward "improved dissemination through the publication of appropriate instructional aids, curricular guides, newsletters, studies, reports, directories, and the like." A large program of curriculum publications is a component of this effort.

All publications released by the department are coordinated by the Division of Public Information and Publications, although writers may be assigned to other program divisions. Writing/editing, design, and production are responsibilities of the six and a half professional staff assigned to this unit.

Edited by the publication staff, North Carolina Public Schools is a quarterly magazine distributed in bulk mail to each of the state's local administrative units. Each school receives enough copies for 75 percent of its teachers. The summer 1973 issue included, among other content, three articles on programs in local schools, one a promising Title III, ESEA project. In addition to this periodical, the division also develops special documents such as the Biennial Report required by law.

Approximately 18 newsletters are distributed by the department. Some are

written by staff assigned to program divisions; others by staff in the publications unit. Although the public information and publications staff is primarily funded by Title V, ESEA, publications are charged to program funds, federal and state. Some of the newsletters are printed internally; some commercially. There are no overall guidelines for newsletters and no emphasis upon coordination of content and format since there is a feeling that newsletters are designed for specific target groups, such as science supervisors or federal coordinators. Among the newsletters are Migrant Matters, published "more or less quarterly"; Federal-State Relations Newsletter; Compensatory Education News, published three times a year; The Flame, published periodically by the Occupational Research Unit; and Title Three Talk. Both Migrant Matters and Compensatory Education News are aimed at parents. Most of the other newsletters have educators as their primary audience.

Geared to the public school teacher or administrator is Benchmarks, a periodic 8-32 page publication. Written by the "disseminator" assigned to compensatory education, it is distributed to all Title I schools, every college library, the state library, some 300 citizens who have requested it, the State Board of Education, the North Carolina congressional delegation, division directors within the DPI, and every superintendent, each of whom gets five copies. Based upon the philosophy "if it works, it's a good thing to spread the word about", the bulletin features writeups of Title I programs. In selecting those to be featured, staff use three sources of information: area supervisors' recommendations, voluntary reports from local units, and project applications. Information gleaned from evaluative reports is frequently included. The purpose of the publication is to "interest people in change or in special programs." Some modifications are anticipated for the 1973-74 school year, with Benchmarks to be published three times with more in depth reports, "up

to four pages" on "model programs." Again area supervisors will be the "first in line in identifying models"; however, curriculum specialists in the department will be more closely involved than in the past. Monitoring of programs selected will update evaluative information. Three or four major areas will be emphasized such as reading, two or three different approaches; parent involvement; and other curriculum areas. The publication will be sent to coordinators with the "hope that it will encourage adoption." Although no evaluation of Benchmarks has been conducted, it is anticipated that effectiveness of the new format will be determined by "increases in certain types of programs which have been described."

Numerous special brochures and bulletins are issued by various divisions. For example, Suggestions for Principals, an 18 page pamphlet, resulted from a series of conferences across the state. It includes suggestions in the areas of public information, human relations, program services, and techniques for principals on "instigating all phases of change." Among other special purpose bulletins are On the Season and The Harvest, featuring Title I Migrant programs. In keeping with the state agency's commitment to planning as a major approach to educational improvement, a Handbook for Planning in the Local School System has been developed. A revised edition was based "on experiences in working extensively with eight North Carolina school systems which are initiating comprehensive planning as the major management tool in improving the effectiveness of the educational enterprise."

AUDIOVISUAL MATERIAL

The department shares responsibility for broadcasting to schools on the educational television network. State funds provide for the acquisition of programs and for supervision to develop effective use of the medium. Using federal funds for teacher training, the department developed a series of

programs to assist classroom teachers in coping with children from special education who were to be in their rooms. The programs were tied to a series of meetings, with a telephone hookup afterward. Staff felt the programs were "helpful in changing attitudes." The department also sponsors a regular program featuring the state superintendent. Much use is also made of slide tape presentations which are staff developed.

INTERNAL COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

Both meetings and printed materials are used in keeping staff informed. The executive staff meets weekly to consider policy and organizational issues. Other staff meetings vary. Our Weekly Reader, published by the publications unit, is for the staff. The research and information center publishes two monthly newsletters primarily to inform staff of recent acquisitions and information available on topics of current concern. Press releases are the cornerstone of the public information program, although educational television is also used. Releases not only detail State Board of Education actions and major departmental activities, but also provide in depth background information and interpretations. Staff credit the series of news stories concerning the North Carolina needs assessment program and results of the testing with "helping the public to understand and accept information that might have caused repercussions." A brief daily taped message, "Dippy Report", is also available for people calling in. Radio stations have found the service especially convenient.

CONCLUSION

Commitment to the flow of information -- from research, evaluation, promising practices -- has been the foundation upon which North Carolina's dissemination and change strategies are built. The dissemination program recognizes that

information must be targeted for different audiences, must reach them through many different media, and must be designed in terms of their needs. Change strategies reflect the belief that decisions must be made at the local level by local people and that the role of the state is to "help schools plan, not to plan for them."

PENNSYLVANIA

With some 12 million total population, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has approximately 2.4 million pupils enrolled in its public schools, kindergarten through twelfth grade. Slightly under 12 percent of these pupils are classified as "black"; .77 percent, as "Spanish-surnamed American"; .16 percent as "American Indian" or "Oriental"; all others account for about 87 percent. Although the total enrollment in public schools declined .4 percent from 1971-72 to 1972-73, there was a 2.6 percent increase in professional staff, with some 128,000 teachers, administrators, and others in the state's 505 school districts.

Total expenditures for public school education in Pennsylvania in the 1971-72 school year were $2,736,702,502, of which 45.3 percent was from local sources; 48.1 percent from state sources; and 6.6 percent from federal sources.

Policy for the Commonwealth's public schools is set by a 17 member State Board of Education appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the state Senate. Members serve six year overlapping terms. Nine members comprise the Council of Basic Education; nine, the Council of Higher Education, with the chairman being a member of both Councils. Chairmen of each Council and the chairman of the Board are designated by the Governor. The 17 members of the Board also serve as the State Board of Vocational Education.

Appointed by the Governor for a four-year term, the Secretary of Education is the chief executive officer of the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE). A member of the Governor's cabinet, the Secretary is responsible to

and advises the Board of Education. In addition to his responsibilities for education, the Secretary also heads up the state library. An executive deputy secretary is "responsible for the overall administration of educational affairs in the Commonwealth." The Information and Publication Office of the department is under his supervision. An assistant deputy secretary coordinates all administrative and executive matters. An executive assistant for public affairs is responsible for legislative services and federal programs.

Approximately 1,200 professional and supportive staff members comprise the two major areas of the department: the Office of Basic Education and the Office of Higher Education. Each office is directed by a deputy secretary/commissioner. The Office of Basic Education is "responsible for the statewide development and administration of public and nonpublic school systems, nursery education through basic adult education." The Office of Higher Education coordinates the department's "activities in providing leadership and service to all segments of higher education." Teacher education and certification responsibilities are lodged in this office.

Three major change and dissemination strategies have been identified by the PDE: specification of priorities and focusing of resources, both people and financial, upon their implementation; development of intermediate units to serve local schools; and institution of a continuing flow of information to "everybody in the educational community - teachers, guidance counselors, administrators, board members" and to governmental and community leaders.

CHANGE STRATEGIES: DEVELOPMENT OF PRIORITIES

Change, like charity, begins "at home" with the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Focus upon priorities permeates the PDE. Developed and revised through a series of meetings of the "top staff", with "everybody asked to

react", the "Secretary's Priorities" are based upon Ten Goals of Quality Education for Pennsylvania adopted by the State Board of Education in March, 1965. Within this broad framework, the PDE over the last year and a half drew up a statement of "philosophy and refined it into a series of 14 more immediate objectives for the next two years." To facilitate accomplishment, the department is moving into a functional structure. A modified Management by Objectives system has been instituted to "ensure adequate translation of priorities and objectives by the staff." Because the secretary sees "the budget as critical to priorities," $500,000 in departmental funds has been reallocated for furthering objectives. "When people couldn't earmark sufficient resources for implementing designated priorities from program budgets, allocation to further the priorities" was made from this half million. ("With resources limited, [you have] to pick high impact items.")

Included among the priorities and the expected outcomes, "not listed in rank order" are the following:

1. Educational Quality Assessment ("improve student performance on the ten goals by X% in Y years.")

2. Strengthened curricula in law, politics, consumerism, environment, fine arts, lifetime sports ("produce and disseminate curriculum packages which will increase students' knowledge, interest and participation.")

3. Executives' Academy ("produce and supply a program which will lead to concrete changes in schools or districts in the areas of curriculum, relationships, supervision.")

4. Citizens' Commission ("implementation of recommendations through new or amended legislation and State Board regulations, program development.")

11. Pre and in-service teacher education ("produce X number of teachers with Y observable competencies by Z date.")

12. Field experiences ("have X students spend Y percentage of their time in Z kinds of field experiences.")

13. Long range planning ("improving the efficiency and effectiveness of education.)

Every unit in the PDE is building its program of activities to assist in furthering the Secretary's Priorities.

Great potential for change is seen in implementation of assessment programs. Pennsylvania has had voluntary assessment of pupils in the fifth and eleventh grades in "close to 300 of the 500 districts in the Commonwealth." In the fall of 1973, the State Board of Education indicated its intention to adopt regulations requiring every school district to participate in tests of all fifth, eighth, and eleventh graders, probably on a three-year cycle. Such a requirement would provide "an information base for making decisions." It "would assist schools to develop a long-range plan." With weaknesses identified through assessment, "an improvement strategy could be developed," not in terms of what the "department wanted", but based upon what was needed at the local level.

An inservice strategy quite "different from the old administrators' meeting" is well under way in the PDE. Plans have been made for establishing in Harrisburg a permanent academy for school executives where superintendents "can come and bring top management people and spend one or two or three weeks in working out a strategy for change in their districts." The strategy "they propose" would be based on their needs. Implementation would be accomplished with assistance from the department. In the fall of 1973, the PDE was negotiating for a home for the academy and looking for a dean to head up the staff. It was anticipated that two or three experiments would be carried out during the 1973-74 school year. With $50,000 in state funds, the academy was being modeled upon the one sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators.

Recommendations contained in a report of a Citizens' Commission due in late

fall 1973, expected to "provide the impetus for changing curriculum regulations ...with focusing attention upon educational outcomes, not input." Composed of 45 members, the Commission was appointed by the Governor in the summer of 1972 "to seek ways to improve the quality of education as well as look at ways the rising costs of education can be held down." The study centered upon seven areas: curriculum, organization for instruction, staffing, management, supportive services, governance, and finance. Three series of public hearings, meetings of professional educators, and statewide dissemination of tentative recommendations - all provided numerous opportunities for input from the field. A seven member staff, including four professionals from the PDE, was assigned to the Commission.

Both pre and in-service are seen as instruments of change. By 1977-78 all teaching certificates will be issued on "the basis of demonstrated performance, not just accumulation of clock hours." Closely related to this development is a change in regulations pertaining to securing a permanent certificate. Teachers in Pennsylvania have long had to prove themselves in the field before they were eligible for a permanent certificate. Twenty-four credits, over and above those required for initial certification, had to be earned. About a year ago, changes in regulations raised from 6 to 24 hours the number of allowable credits for inservice education. Only inservice which meets certain standards and which has been approved prior to implementation may be counted toward permanent certification. In keeping with the trend "toward more flexibility and local autonomy," inservice programs must be developed by councils which include representatives of teachers' organizations, administrators, students, boards, intermediate units, institutions of higher education, and the community. These councils are the only agency which may submit a plan to the PDE for an approved program. They must be "sensitive to the needs and

requests of the teachers in their area." Inservice must be "individualized, competency-based, and part of an on-going program." Field coordinators from the PDE are working in three regions to build inservice councils. In addition the department will make curriculum specialists available as facilitators; department staff are "helpers, not big brothers."

A change in education being promoted by the department is the development of field experiences. "Getting schools and communities involved with each other to improve the education of students is the idea." A number of field experiences programs were explored in the 1973 Education Congress documentary "The World - Our Classroom." Further evidence of departmental interest in "the community as educator" can be seen in administration of Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A staff member reported that "in the years ahead Title III projects will be focused on priorities such as field experiences."

Based upon the philosophy that if "a district is going to effect change it must do it by plan," the department is directing attention toward development of a comprehensive planning model. An 8 member team, including four PDE staff members, two from an intermediate unit, and two from local districts, are developing the model which "should be adaptable to any region." University staff are serving as consultants and facilitators. Once the model is developed, the team will help the other 28 regions of the state to acquire skills to bring about long-range planning. For some years, the department has required schools to have 10 year plans, primarily concerned with building needs. Now a new regulation is before the State Board of Education which would focus school plans upon curriculum and educational outcomes. The model being developed is in keeping with the move toward making "local boards more autonomous" and moving "the department into an advisory role." Basically the model will direct attention toward the district's educational assessment and

the needs identified. The district would be assisted to consider "what plans are needed to bring up those below norms," and "an improvement strategy" would be developed. As an aid in developing this strategy, the PDE would be responsible for identifying programs from across the state that "are working." This "cookbook of things schools have done to improve" would provide alternatives which others might try. Through the quality assessment program, the department provides schools tools for diagnosis; through the lists of "things that are working," the PDE helps them to prescribe needed changes.

CHANGE STRATEGY: ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERMEDIATE UNITS

Two years ago Pennsylvania abolished its 67 county superintendents' offices and, in their place, established 29 intermediate units (IU) supported in part by state funds. Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were each designated as an IU. Not a "part of the hierarchical structure," the intermediate unit is considered a local education agency. Service oriented, IUs are staffed with "people who can translate policy into things schools can use." Basic to this development was the growing realization that the limited number of curriculum specialists in the PDE in Harrisburg could not work effectively with the thousands of teachers who needed their services. Staff located nearer to local schools were "crucial in bringing valid practices to those in the field." One staff member described the role of the IUs as "catalysts for change in their regions." The major function of the units is to provide "those support services to local schools which can be more efficiently and effectively carried out by a cental regional office." Two services are mandated - special education, if it is not provided by schools, and regional instructional materials centers. Many IUs operate regional vocational centers. Most provide planning services. Under the legislation establishing intermediate units, the PDE can mandate services through the IUs, however, the department has "chosen to stay away from mandates

and to develop a cooperative relationship between the PDE staff and the units." Both staff and services vary in the IUs; some are staffed by as few as five; others by as many as 50. The executive board of directors of each IU is composed of representatives of boards of education of each participating district; participation is permissive. This board names the executive director of each unit. An advisory council, composed of the superintendents from each district, plays a major role in determining unit services. Each month the executive directors meet with staff in Harrisburg for an agenda planned jointly by the department and the IUs. The PDE frequently uses this as "a time for telling the directors about new directions" and for securing reaction from the field.

STRATEGY FOR CHANGE: FLOW OF INFORMATION

A major vehicle for dissemination, Pennsylvania Education is a four page tabloid published biweekly, September to June. Approximately 185,000 copies of the newspaper are distributed to educators, governmental leaders, news media, community leaders, and interested citizens. Supported by state funds, Pennsylvania Education features articles about educational programs and activities in local schools, intermediate units, and the department. A special effort is made to give coverage to priorities with the editor checking before each issue with the three full time staff members who are concerned with implementation of priorities. Although the majority of the newspaper is staff written, manuscripts are solicited from the field. Just beginning its second year, the tabloid has not been formally evaluated as yet, although response to requests for articles indicates interest in the publication. A plan for evaluation is to be developed this year.

Once the traditional administrators' meeting, with superintendents coming into Harrisburg to the department, Education Congress for the last two years has taken the form of a broadcast over the Pennsylvania Public Television

Network. The September 1973 Congress featured a 30 minute film showing six examples of community based educational programs and a 30 minute videotape of the Secretary of Education and the commissioners for basic and higher education discussing "field experiences and how these might relate to local school people." The film showed "what's going on and community reaction to innovations." The panel discussion brought up the problems associated with change and how to solve them.

The seven stations in the public television network first broadcast the program from 9 to 10 o'clock in the morning; some rebroadcast it during afternoon and evening hours. At least one station included a local panel in addition to the department program. A number of school faculties saw the film during an inservice day. Schools or colleges unable to view the telecast were to "videotape the program off the air for showing at a more convenient date" or to "submit a blank 60 minute tape to the department" for duplication. Some 20 consultants from the PDE took "out sets and tape and presented Education Congress to staffs in local schools."

Programs spotlighted in the film were recommended by staffs of intermediate units, school administrators groups, and the PDE. A committee composed of people with special knowledge of and interest in field experiences narrowed the recommendations down to 15 "good programs". The publication office actually selected the six programs. Although the film was produced by a commercial firm, a PDE staff member acted as executive producer.

The first issue of Pennsylvania Education after the Congress asked for reaction to the telecast. Readers were requested to complete a seven question form "to help the department plan next year's Education Congress." Those responding were asked to identify themselves as teacher, administrator - elementary

secondary, or college; parent; or other; to indicate the time of viewing and their reactions to the film, panel, and field experience programs in general. A note was included that "if you want more information on field experience programs, write the editor Pennsylvania Education."

Three information centers are funded through the department under various federal sources: Research and Information Services for Education (RISE), designed for those in general education, Vocational Education Information Network (VEIN); and Pennsylvania Research Information on Special Education (PRISE). Each is located in a different place; each is some distance from the department.

Originally a project funded through a county superintendent's office to handle Title III dissemination, RISE has gradually broadened its focus, although it is still funded through an intermediate unit. It continues to send abstracts and manuals on Title III to all Pennsylvania schools. However, the statewide project serves participating intermediate units as a complete information center. Supported from a number of sources, including a subscription fee charged client IUs, RISE has full ERIC files, a large library of general educational books and reference tools, several hundred journals, and special resources such as Psychological Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts, California Learning Activity Packets on microfiche, and previous searches done by the center. Services are available on a subscription basis to intermediate units, with fees based upon average daily attendance and number of searches. Currently 23 IUs are participating. For each, RISE has trained a staff member as a resource utilization specialist (RUS) who transmits requests for information from schools to RISE, with some negotiation of the question; supplies microfiche readers if needed, and does some delivery of packets of information. In

response to requests, RISE will send a bibliography and abstracts of ERIC materials and a bibliography of other pertinent information in the center. Journal articles and ERIC resources marked by the client on the bibliographies are supplied either in hard copy or microfiche. Searches are done both by the computer and manually. Additional RISE services include distribution upon request of copies of previous services (a current catalogue lists some 850 on hand); a newsletter which features information about Title III projects and services available; and one day workshops on Title III. RISE has a small professional staff augmented by part time searchers and public school students who duplicate microfiche.

Like RISE, PRISE is exploring the use of subscription fees as the primary method of support. Any teacher in the system can call upon PRISE for information about special education. PRISE can do searches from "any resource" and can "tap into those across the country." Searches are primarily manual.

VEIN developed from the "mission of the vocational research coordinating unit to flow research and related information to practitioners." Originally funded under RCU research money, VEIN was placed in a state college "to see if it would work in that setting." Now funded by Vocational Education, Part B money, VEIN directs information to specific audiences. Resources include ERIC, periodicals, reference materials, models, and applications. Some searches are done on the computer, with manual searches "to refine." Packets sent out include microfiche, hardcopy, and, if needed, a microfiche reader. Much of the contract work from VEIN is done by telephone, with the staff feeling that "information consultants in intermediate units would dilute the relationship between the VEIN staff and the client." VEIN also provides curriculum services for vocational education, identifying materials developed by projects which should

be disseminated and making them available either through ERIC or through a Pennsylvania file. VEIN periodically publishes an Administrators Bulletin to develop "current awareness." It contains a bibliography of documents representing a "selection of topical subjects - research, flexible scheduling, extended school year, instruction objective techniques...intended to contain information of continuing and general interest to administrators." EDUCATION NOW, another current awareness bulletin, is developed for specific audiences or on a specific topic. The January 1973 issue contained a "selection of documents in ERIC for administrators and teachers" on adult education. An earlier bulletin listed ERIC documents of interest to school librarians. VEIN responded to some 500 requests for information in 1972-73. Federally funded at present, VEIN, according to staff, "probably could not survive if these resources were withdrawn."

A plan is under development in the department for incorporating PRISE and VEIN under RISE for efficiency and effectiveness. It is envisioned that the 29 intermediate units would form an information network with each IU having an information consultant to work with local schools. A DPE staff member noted that "instead of having 100,000 different people to disseminate to, with a network there would be 29." A training program would be developed for the information consultants.

The state library housed in the PDE building provides a professional resource for the staff. A complete ERIC collection also serves the department.

PUBLICATIONS

An extensive publications program is coordinated by the Office of Information and Publications. All bulletins, brochures, and the like with distribution outside the department are edited and processed by the office. Although the

PDE develops curriculum guides, increasingly these are being focused upon the 14 Secretary's Priorities. In addition, there is a feeling that as the department works with "teachers and makes them curriculum conscious, teachers can design their own guides." With departmental emphasis upon priorities, any publication which does not further one of the 14 has to be submitted to the Secretary of Education for clearance before it can be published. A number of special publications are printed, such as Our Schools Today, a series of "annual publications designed to provide current data for all persons interested in basic education in Pennsylvania." Annual evaluation reports, reports on special projects such as the Citizens' Commission study, and activities such as the Educational Quality Assessment program are also widely distributed. Unlike many departments, the Pennsylvania state education agency does not encourage the publication of newsletters for specific audiences. Funding for the dissemination of information through printed materials is from a number of sources, state and federal.

DISSEMINATION THROUGH EVALUATION

Evaluation of federal projects by teams composed of local school and college people was described as "an unconscious dissemination activity which became a very conscious practice." Teams, each member of which has been through a training session, visit approximately 160 Title I schools and all Title III projects annually. Title I schools are evaluated on a three-year cycle. As one staff member reported, "People tend to believe what they hear and see themselves from fellow directors." Consequently, these team visits, which provide opportunity for viewing every facet of a program have "diffused practices across the state." The "evaluators," so one staff member noted, "carry practices back to their own schools like bees carrying pollen around." Syntheses of evaluation reports provide some additional information to schools about "what's

working." Members of the teams are paid by the PDE from federal funds to administer the programs.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

Keeping the public informed of priorities and programs is also viewed as an important agency function. Title V, ESEA, funds provide the primary support for efforts to flow information to the general public through the mass media.

Films, such as the one featuring the field experiences programs in local schools and one on the work of the Citizens' Commission, have been shown on public television. Currently being explored is the feasibility of five to ten minute slots on public television. A weekly radio show, aired on 50 stations, features five three minute segments in which the Secretary of Education answers questions. Evidence of effectiveness of the taped program can be seen in a survey in which stations indicated they wanted it continued. Press releases for newspapers and the electronic media are also developed, with staff members in the publications and information unit each being responsible for contacting an assigned bureau each week to ensure coverage of all major programs and activities. Slide tape presentations are also developed for special purposes.

SUMMARY

Targeting of resources, both financial and human, upon a limited number of priorities has been a key strategy employed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education to bring about educational change. Included among these priorities is full development of intermediate units to get services close to schools and to assist schools in looking at their own needs and devising their own answers to problems. Dissemination of information through printed materials, educational meetings, personal contact is the base upon which change can be built.

CONCLUSION

A number of overall impressions emerge from the study. In every state education agency visited there was commitment to educational change and a firm conviction that it is the agency's responsibility to be the catalyst for that change. Equally apparent was the emphasis upon information dissemination as a necessary component of any change strategy. Different in size, pupil population, resources available, public school and state agency organization and management, the nine states in the study were remarkably similar in the basic assumptions upon which they were building their change strategies. The words in the interviews may have varied, but the themes were the same:

> "Local planning is the key to educational change."
>
> "It's the role of the state education agency to facilitate choice of programs, not to dictate selection."
>
> "Inservice is basic to diffusion."
>
> "No one strategy will work with all schools."
>
> "There must be broad participation from both the community and the profession in decision making if change is to be affected."
>
> "The state agency is - and must remain - the primary linker between research and development and the educational practitioner."

LOCAL PLANNING: KEY TO CHANGE

Six of the nine states included in the survey identified as their major change strategy an agency program to install comprehensive educational planning at the local level. Two additional states included activities aimed at strengthening school district planning among their change efforts. Strategies in these

eight states took various forms. In Michigan emphasis was upon the "Accountability Model"; in Colorado, it was the "school improvement process leading to contract accreditation." Montana focused upon the "School-Community Assistance Process," while New York looked to Project Redesign to make fundamental changes in local education agencies. Illinois, Florida, and North Carolina had incorporated requirements for comprehensive educational planning into accreditation standards. Pennsylvania was considering such a move. The mechanisms for implementing local planning varied from state to state, but the goal was the same: to help schools help themselves.

In general, in each of these state agency change strategies, there was a systematic approach to assisting districts to 1) identify local educational needs with widespread involvement of citizens, students, and teachers; 2) to set goals and performance objectives; 3) assess pupil progress and analyze program effectiveness in terms of the district's own goals and objectives; 4) identify and select alternative practices and programs; 5) evaluate programs implemented; and then 6) recycle. There was pervasive focus upon "educational output" as the measure of program effectiveness, not "educational input." Schools were being helped to ask questions concerned with "how well," not "how many."

A number of implications for state education agency operation were inherent in efforts to install a planning capability at the local level. The agency's role was seen as catalytic and facilitative. New patterns of providing technical assistance were emerging. There was growth in regionalization, getting services closer to schools. In numerous states there appeared a trend away from agency specialists who were content oriented toward generalists who were process oriented. Another significant change was evident in

the state education agency/local education agency relationship. There was a "reaching out" to schools. Not waiting to be called in, the state agency was assigning staff to serve schools on a continuing basis. These consultants were seen as information linkers, not providers of "instant answers." In addition to their duties in developing local planning skills, they assisted district personnel in such tasks as identifying resources and designing inservice in terms of the schools' own pupils and teachers and community. In short, these generalists helped schools to find their own solutions.

It might be said that, to some degree, state education agency change strategies reflect what Havelock has described as the "linkage model" for dissemination and knowledge utilization:

> Linkage is seen as a series of two-way interaction processes which connect user systems with various resource systems including basic and applied research, development, and practice. Senders and receivers can achieve successful linkage only if they exchange messages in a two-way interaction and continuously make the effort to simulate each other's problem solving behavior. (Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ronald G. Havelock in collaboration with Alan Guskin, Mark Frohman, Mary Havelock, Marjorie Hill, and Janet Huber. Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge. Institute for Social Research. The University of Michigan. Ann Arbor. Second Printing, 1971.)

Like Havelock's model with its emphasis upon interaction, state agency efforts are, to a large extent, dependent upon the relationship between the consultant assigned to work with a district and the educational practitioner. Neither change agents nor dissemination agents in the traditional sense, state agency staff assisting local districts to develop planning capability have characteristics of both.

under way was the assumption that it was the state's responsibility to identify promising local programs and to make information about them readily available to school people. It was equally clear that the agencies did not believe it was their function to advocate or "sell" any one solution. Their actions implied that the state's role is to provide information about many alternative programs. In short, there appeared to be a decided shift from the "marketing model" for change to what might be termed the "consumer model."

Efforts were being implemented in a number of states to identify promising programs. For example, staff in Montana, Iowa, and New York spoke of compiling files of such programs. Other activities described were also designed to provide schools information about alternative solutions. Florida was developing ways to disseminate the products resulting from the state's research and development program. In Michigan, the first steps had been taken to set up a network of demonstration schools. Conferences and audiovisual presentations were also being used in disseminating the information. New York, North Carolina, Florida, and Montana were among the states describing efforts to encourage on-site visits as a vehicle for diffusing good practices. Some states indicated that the major constraint in implementing files of promising programs was "the state of the art" in screening programs to be included. Evaluation of programs meriting dissemination was limited.

Closely related to these developments were the information center activities in five of the nine states in the study: Iowa, New York, Florida, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania. Two additional states, Michigan and Illinois, had some information activities under way, although they did not operate general information centers. In Illinois the special education materials center provided information support to the state education agency staff on a limited basis and in Michigan the state library, a component of the education agency, served

the staff. Although each of the major information retrieval services was set and operated differently, there were common practices. For example, Iowa, New York, Florida, and Pennsylvania had all to some extent regionalized services to serve local schools. Staff in each state center reported the use of information consultants on a part time basis as "information linkers." These consultants, who had been trained by the state staff, were usually volunteers who added information duties to other full time responsibilities. They worked with school staffs to specify requests and, in some cases, returned the packets of information to the requester. Although not fully operational, a communication network was resulting from the work of these consultants, a network through which information could flow both to and from the state agency. Each center director touched upon the need to implement the network concept more fully and to provide additional information consultant services. And, just as often, the major constraint to expansion was cited: limited resources, both human and fiscal. One staff member noted that the center could not "advertise" its service because it could not meet the demand if it did. The need for inaugurating information retrieval services where none currently exist was also pointed out.

Evaluation of information center operation was largely quantitative, but efforts were being developed in some states to determine the impact upon both classroom instruction and school district operation. In every state with an information center there was recognition of the importance of evaluating the service in terms of changed educational practice. With repeated references to the need to institute or to strengthen files or catalogues of exemplary programs, there appeared to be consensus that information center activities are central to diffusion of promising practices.

Other printed information at varying levels of complexity was also considered

supportive of change strategies. The departmental periodical, or newsletter, was frequently mentioned as a primary dissemination device at the awareness level. All nine states published some form of periodical or newsletter. Once aimed primarily at administrators, these agency publications are increasingly being distributed to all teachers within a state. Apparently other states share the opinion of an Iowa staff member that the "department tabloid is a major link with teachers." Equally important in the view of some of those interviewed, the agency newspaper is being sent to school board members, legislators, and other interested citizens. As one staff member noted, "Dissemination must not stop with educators."

Although there was emphasis upon printed materials with many of the nine states reporting annual publication of a number of bulletins and other materials, it was evident that there is shift away from the traditional curriculum guide. The majority of the states in the study which still included curriculum guides in their dissemination programs had moved from guides primarily concerned with "course prescriptions" to bulletins emphasizing the process of curriculum development. One staff member may have explained this trend when he reported that "the state agency is helping teachers become curriculum developers."

Responsibility for dissemination, whether through printed materials or personal contact, was usually dispersed throughout the department. As one staff member remarked, "There is a need to get dissemination out of the cubby holes." Another concern voiced by many of those interviewed was that the whole matter of dissemination to key decision makers needed to be more fully explored. School board members and state legislators were the two groups most frequently mentioned. All in all, however, it was clearly evident from the survey that dissemination is increasingly being recognized as a major function of a state agency and steps are being taken to strengthen efforts.

At the conclusion of the visits to the nine states, one impression stood out above all others: state education agencies are where the action is. There is focus upon priorities, commitment to change for educational improvement, and a continuing search for ways to serve local districts better.